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Equipping citizens with the skills necessary to achieve their full potential, participate in an increasingly interconnected global economy, and ultimately convert better jobs into better lives is a central preoccupation of policy makers around the world. Results from the OECD's recent Survey of Adult Skills show that highly skilled adults are twice as likely to be employed and almost three times more likely to earn an above-median salary than poorly skilled adults. In other words, poor skills severely limit people's access to better-paying and more rewarding jobs. Highly skilled people are also more likely to volunteer, see themselves as actors rather than as objects of political processes, and are more likely to trust others. Fairness, integrity and inclusiveness in public policy thus all hinge on the skills of citizens.

The ongoing economic crisis has only increased the urgency of investing in the acquisition and development of citizens' skills - both through the education system and in the workplace. At a time when public budgets are tight and there is little room for further monetary and fiscal stimulus, investing in structural reforms to boost productivity, such as education and skills development, is key to future growth. Indeed, investment in these areas is essential to support the recovery, as well as to address long-standing issues such as youth unemployment and gender inequality.

In this context, more and more countries are looking beyond their own borders for evidence of the most successful and efficient policies and practices. Indeed, in a global economy, success is no longer measured against national standards alone, but against the best-performing and most rapidly improving education systems. Over the past decade, the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA, has become the world's premier yardstick for evaluating the quality, equity and efficiency of school systems. But the evidence base that PISA has produced goes well beyond statistical benchmarking. By identifying the characteristics of high-performing education systems PISA allows governments and educators to identify effective policies that they can then adapt to their local contexts.

The results from the PISA 2012 assessment, which was conducted at a time when many of the 65 participating countries and economies were grappling with the effects of the crisis, reveal wide differences in education outcomes, both within and across countries. Using the data collected in previous PISA rounds, we have been able to track the evolution of student performance over time and across subjects. Of the 64 countries and economies with comparable data, 40 improved their average performance in at least one subject. Top performers such as Shanghai in China or Singapore were able to further extend their lead, while countries like Brazil, Mexico, Tunisia and Turkey achieved major improvements from previously low levels of performance.

Some education systems have demonstrated that it is possible to secure strong and equitable learning outcomes at the same time as achieving rapid improvements. Of the 13 countries and economies that significantly improved their mathematics performance between 2003 and 2012, three also show improvements in equity in education during the same period, and another nine improved their performance while maintaining an already high level of equity - proving that countries do not have to sacrifice high performance to achieve equity in education opportunities.

Nonetheless, PISA 2012 results show wide differences between countries in mathematics performance. The equivalent of almost six years of schooling, 245 score points, separates the highest and lowest average performances
of the countries that took part in the PISA 2012 mathematics assessment. The difference in mathematics performances within countries is even greater, with over 300 points - the equivalent of more than seven years of schooling - often separating the highest- and the lowest-achieving students in a country. Clearly, all countries and economies have excellent students, but few have enabled all students to excel.

The report also reveals worrying gender differences in students' attitudes towards mathematics: even when girls perform as well as boys in mathematics, they report less perseverance, less motivation to learn mathematics, less belief in their own mathematics skills, and higher levels of anxiety about mathematics. While the average girl underperforms in mathematics compared with the average boy, the gender gap in favour of boys is even wider among the highest-achieving students. These findings have serious implications not only for higher education, where young women are already underrepresented in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields of study, but also later on, when these young women enter the labour market. This confirms the findings of the OECD Gender Strategy, which identifies some of the factors that create - and widen - the gender gap in education, labour and entrepreneurship. Supporting girls' positive attitudes towards and investment in learning mathematics will go a long way towards narrowing this gap.

PISA 2012 also finds that the highest-performing school systems are those that allocate educational resources more equitably among advantaged and disadvantaged schools and that grant more autonomy over curricula and assessments to individual schools. A belief that all students can achieve at a high level and a willingness to engage all stakeholders in education - including students, through such channels as seeking student feedback on teaching practices - are hallmarks of successful school systems.

PISA is not only an accurate indicator of students' abilities to participate fully in society after compulsory school, but also a powerful tool that countries and economies can use to fine-tune their education policies. There is no single combination of policies and practices that will work for everyone, everywhere. Every country has room for improvement, even the top performers. That's why the OECD produces this triennial report on the state of education across the globe: to share evidence of the best policies and practices and to offer our timely and targeted support to help countries provide the best education possible for all of their students. With high levels of youth unemployment, rising inequality, a significant gender gap, and an urgent need to boost growth in many countries, we have no time to lose. The OECD stands ready to support policy makers in this challenging and crucial endeavour.


This report is the product of a collaborative effort between the countries participating in PISA, the experts and institutions working within the framework of the PISA Consortium, and the OECD Secretariat. The report was drafted by Andreas Schleicher, Francesco Avvisati, Francesca Borgonovi, Miyako Ikeda, Hiromichi Katayama, Flore-Anne Messy, Chiara Monticone, Guillermo Montt, Sophie Vayssettes and Pablo Zoido of the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills and the Directorate for Financial Affairs, with statistical support from Simone Bloem and Giannina Rech and editorial oversight by Marilyn Achiron. Additional analytical and editorial support was provided by Adele Atkinson, Jonas Bertling, Marika Boiron, Célia Braga-Schich, Tracey Burns, Michael Davidson, Cassandra Davis, Elizabeth Del Bourgo, John A. Dossey, Joachim Funke, Samuel Greiff, Tue Halgreen, Ben Jensen, Eckhard Klieme, André Laboul, Henry Levin, Juliette Mendelovits, Tadakazu Miki, Christian Monseur, Simon Normandeau, Mathilde Overduin, Elodie Pools, Dara Ramalingam, William H. Schmidt (whose work was supported by the Thomas J. Alexander fellowship programme), Kaye Stacey, Lazar Stankov, Ross Turner, Elisabeth Villoutreix and Allan Wigfield. The system-level data collection was conducted by the OECD NESLI (INES Network for the Collection and Adjudication of System-Level Descriptive Information on Educational Structures, Policies and Practices) team: Bonifacio Agapin, Estelle Herbaut and Jean Yip. Volume II also draws on the analytic work undertaken by Jaap Scheerens and Douglas Willms in the context of PISA 2000. Administrative support was provided by Claire Chetcuti, Juliet Evans, Jennah Huxley and Diana Tramontano.
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## Executive Summary

The organisation of learning environments is related to education outcomes. As in other organisations, decisions taken at one level in a school system are affected by decisions taken at other levels. For example, what happens in the classroom is influenced by decisions taken at the school level; and decisions taken at the school level are affected by the decisions - particularly those concerning resources, policies and practices - taken by district, regional and/or national education administrations.

## Stratification in school systems, which is the result of policies like grade repetition and selecting students at a young age for different programmes or "tracks", is negatively related to equity; and students in highly stratified systems tend to be less motivated than those in less-stratified systems.

In systems where students are more likely to repeat a grade, the impact of students' socio-economic status on their academic performance is stronger than in systems where this type of stratification is not practiced. In 35 of 61 countries and economies examined, when comparing two students with similar mathematics performance, the student who is more socio-economically disadvantaged is more likely to have repeated a grade. Across OECD countries, an average of $12 \%$ of students reported that they had repeated a grade at least once. Among the 13 countries and economies that had grade repetition rates of more than $20 \%$ in 2003, these rates dropped by an average of 3.5 percentage points by 2012, and fell sharply in France, Luxembourg, Macao-China, Mexico and Tunisia.

How resources are allocated in education is just as important as the amount of resources available to be allocated.
PISA results show that beyond a certain level of expenditure per student, excellence in education requires more than money. Among countries and economies whose per capita GDP is more than USD 20000 , including most OECD countries, systems that pay teachers more (i.e. higher teachers' salaries relative to national income per capita) tend to perform better in mathematics.

High-performing countries and economies tend to allocate resources more equitably across socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.
That said, PISA results show that in many school systems, resources are not allocated equitably: On average across OECD countries, while disadvantaged schools tend to have smaller classes, they tend to be more likely to suffer from teacher shortages, and shortages or inadequacy of educational materials and physical infrastructures than advantaged schools.

Most countries and economies with comparable data between 2003 and 2012 have moved towards better-staffed and better-equipped schools.
Of the 36 countries and economies with comparable data for this period, 21 saw a reduction in student-teacher ratios; 20 of 38 countries and economies with comparable data saw a reduction in teacher shortages; and more school principals in 2012 than in 2003 reported that schools are in good physical condition.

Students in 2012 were more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to have attended at least one year of pre-primary education.
While more 15 -old students reported to have enrolled in pre-primary education during the period, many of the students who reported that they had not attended pre-primary school are disadvantaged - the students who could benefit most from pre-primary education.

If offered a choice of schools for their child, parents are more likely to consider such criteria as "a safe school environment" and "a school's good reputation" more important than "high academic achievement of students in the school".
The criteria parents use to choose a school for their child not only vary across school systems, but also within systems. In all countries and economies with data from parents, socio-economically disadvantaged parents are more likely than advantaged parents to report that they considered "low expenses" and "financial aid" to be very important criteria in choosing a school.

In 37 participating countries and economies, students who attend private schools (either government-dependent or government-independent schools) are more socio-economically advantaged than those who attend public schools.
The difference in the average socio-economic status of students in private schools compared with those in public schools is particularly large in Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, Poland and Uruguay. Only in Chinese Taipei is the average socio-economic status of students who attend public schools more advantaged than that of those who attend private schools.

## Schools in high-performing systems tend to have more responsibility for curricula and assessments.

Schools with more autonomy tend to perform better than schools with less autonomy when they are part of school systems with more accountability arrangements and greater teacher-principal collaboration in school management.

Between 2003 and 2012 there was a clear trend towards schools using student assessments to compare the school's performance with district or national performance and with that of other schools.
On average across OECD countries, in 2003, $46 \%$ of students attended schools whose principal reported that the school uses student assessment data to compare itself against national or district performance; by $2012,62 \%$ of students attended such schools. Similarly, the percentage of students who attended schools that use assessment data to compare themselves to other schools increased from $40 \%$ to $52 \%$ during the period. The use of student-assessment data to compare against national or regional benchmarks or with other schools increased most notably in Brazil, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg and Portugal, and declined only in Finland between 2003 and 2012.

## Systems with larger proportions of students who arrive late for school and skip classes tend to show lower overall performance.

Schools with more student truancy and more disciplinary problems are also those with more socio-economically disadvantaged student populations. But even when comparing schools of similar socio-economic status, students in schools with more disciplinary problems tend to perform worse than their peers in schools with a better disciplinary climate.

According to students' reports, teacher-student relations improved between 2003 and 2012 in all but one country, Tunisia, where they remained stable.
The share of students who "agree" or "strongly agree" that they get along with most teachers increased by 12 percentage points on average across OECD countries during the period and increased by more than ten percentage points in 22 countries and economies.

Between 2003 and 2012, disciplinary climate also improved on average across OECD countries and across 27 individual countries and economies.
Disciplinary climate improved the most in the Czech Republic, Hong Kong-China, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg and Norway, but deteriorated in Germany and Tunisia during the period. PISA results also show that in 45 countries and economies, schools whose student population is predominantly socio-economically disadvantaged tend to have a more negative disciplinary climate.

## Reader's Guide

## Data underlying the figures

The data referred to in this volume are presented in Annex B and, in greater detail, including some additional tables, on the PISA website (www.pisa.oecd.org).

Four symbols are used to denote missing data:
a The category does not apply in the country concerned. Data are therefore missing.
c There are too few observations or no observation to provide reliable estimates (i.e. there are fewer than 30 students or fewer than 5 schools with valid data).
$m$ Data are not available. These data were not submitted by the country or were collected but subsequently removed from the publication for technical reasons.
w Data have been withdrawn or have not been collected at the request of the country concerned.

## Country coverage

This publication features data on 65 countries and economies, including all 34 OECD countries and 31 partner countries and economies (see map in the section What is PISA?).

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Two notes were added to the statistical data related to Cyprus:

1. Note by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".
2. Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

## Calculating international averages

An OECD average corresponding to the arithmetic mean of the respective country estimates was calculated for most indicators presented in this report. The OECD average is used to compare performance across school systems. In the case of some countries, data may not be available for specific indicators, or specific categories may not apply. Readers should, therefore, keep in mind that the term "OECD average" refers to the OECD countries included in the respective comparisons.

## Rounding figures

Because of rounding, some figures in tables may not exactly add up to the totals. Totals, differences and averages are always calculated on the basis of exact numbers and are rounded only after calculation.

All standard errors in this publication have been rounded to one or two decimal places. Where the value 0.0 or 0.00 is shown, this does not imply that the standard error is zero, but that it is smaller than 0.05 or 0.005 , respectively.

## Reporting student data

The report uses " 15 -year-olds" as shorthand for the PISA target population. PISA covers students who are aged between 15 years 3 months and 16 years 2 months at the time of assessment and who are enrolled in school and have completed at least 6 years of formal schooling, regardless of the type of institution in which they are enrolled and of whether they are in full-time or part-time education, of whether they attend academic or vocational programmes, and of whether they attend public or private schools or foreign schools within the country.

## Reporting school data

The principals of the schools in which students were assessed provided information on their schools' characteristics by completing a school questionnaire. Where responses from school principals are presented in this publication, they are weighted so that they are proportionate to the number of 15 -year-olds enrolled in the school.

## Focusing on statistically significant differences

This volume discusses only statistically significant differences or changes. These are denoted in darker colours in figures and in bold font in tables. See Annex A3 for further information.

## Abbreviations used in this report

| ESCS | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status | PPP | Purchasing power parity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| GDP | Gross domestic product | S.D. | Standard deviation |
| ISCED | International Standard Classification of Education | S.E. | Standard error |
| ISCO | International Standard Classification <br> of Occupations | STEMScience, Technology, Engineering <br> and Mathematics |  |

## Further documentation

For further information on the PISA assessment instruments and the methods used in PISA, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming). The reader should note that there are gaps in the numbering of tables because some tables appear on line only and are not included in this publication. To consult the set of web-only data tables, visit the PISA website (www.pisa.oecd.org).
This report uses the OECD StatLinks service. Below each table and chart is a url leading to a corresponding Excel ${ }^{\top \mathrm{M}}$ workbook containing the underlying data. These urls are stable and will remain unchanged over time. In addition, readers of the e-books will be able to click directly on these links and the workbook will open in a separate window, if their internet browser is open and running.

## What is PISA?

"What is important for citizens to know and be able to do?" That is the question that underlies the triennial survey of 15 -year-old students around the world known as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). PISA assesses the extent to which students near the end of compulsory education have acquired key knowledge and skills that are essential for full participation in modern societies. The assessment, which focuses on reading, mathematics, science and problem solving, does not just ascertain whether students can reproduce knowledge; it also examines how well students can extrapolate from what they have learned and apply that knowledge in unfamiliar settings, both in and outside of school. This approach reflects the fact that modern economies reward individuals not for what they know, but for what they can do with what they know.

PISA is an ongoing programme that offers insights for education policy and practice, and that helps monitor trends in students' acquisition of knowledge and skills across countries and economies and in different demographic subgroups within each country. PISA results reveal what is possible in education by showing what students in the highest-performing and most rapidly improving school systems can do. The findings allow policy makers around the world to gauge the knowledge and skills of students in their own countries in comparison with those in other countries, set policy targets against measurable goals achieved by other school systems, and learn from policies and practices applied elsewhere. While PISA cannot identify cause-and-effect relationships between policies/practices and student outcomes, it can show educators, policy makers and the interested public how education systems are similar and different - and what that means for students.

## A test the whole world can take

PISA is now used as an assessment tool in many regions around the world. It was implemented in 43 countries and economies in the first assessment ( 32 in 2000 and 11 in 2002), 41 in the second assessment (2003), 57 in the third assessment (2006) and 75 in the fourth assessment (65 in 2009 and 10 in 2010). So far, 65 countries and economies have participated in PISA 2012.

In addition to OECD member countries, the survey has been or is being conducted in:
East, South and Southeast Asia: Himachal Pradesh-India, Hong Kong-China, Indonesia, Macao-China, Malaysia, Shanghai-China, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, Tamil Nadu-India, Thailand and Viet Nam.

Central, Mediterranean and Eastern Europe, and Central Asia: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, the Russian Federation and Serbia.

The Middle East: Jordan, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.
Central and South America: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Netherlands-Antilles, Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Miranda-Venezuela.

Africa: Mauritius and Tunisia.
Decisions about the scope and nature of the PISA assessments and the background information to be collected are made by participating countries based on recommendations from leading experts. Considerable efforts and resources are devoted to achieving cultural and linguistic breadth and balance in assessment materials. Since the design and translation of the test, as well as sampling and data collection, are subject to strict quality controls, PISA findings are considered to be highly valid and reliable.


1. Note by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".
2. Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

PISA's unique features include its:

- policy orientation, which links data on student learning outcomes with data on students' backgrounds and attitudes towards learning and on key factors that shape their learning, in and outside of school, in order to highlight differences in performance and identify the characteristics of students, schools and school systems that perform well;
- innovative concept of "literacy", which refers to students' capacity to apply knowledge and skills in key subjects, and to analyse, reason and communicate effectively as they identify, interpret and solve problems in a variety of situations;
- relevance to lifelong learning, as PISA asks students to report on their motivation to learn, their beliefs about themselves, and their learning strategies;
- regularity, which enables countries and economies to monitor their progress in meeting key learning objectives; and
- breadth of coverage, which, in PISA 2012, encompasses the 34 OECD member countries and 31 partner countries and economies.


## Key features of PISA 2012

## The content

- The PISA 2012 survey focused on mathematics, with reading, science and problem solving as minor areas of assessment. For the first time, PISA 2012 also included an assessment of the financial literacy of young people, which was optional for countries and economies.
- PISA assesses not only whether students can reproduce knowledge, but also whether they can extrapolate from what they have learned and apply their knowledge in new situations. It emphasises the mastery of processes, the understanding of concepts, and the ability to function in various types of situations.


## The students

- Around 510000 students completed the assessment in 2012, representing about 28 million 15-year-olds in the schools of the 65 participating countries and economies.


## The assessment

- Paper-based tests were used, with assessments lasting a total of two hours for each student. In a range of countries and economies, an additional 40 minutes were devoted to the computer-based assessment of mathematics, reading and problem solving.
- Test items were a mixture of multiple-choice items and questions requiring students to construct their own responses. The items were organised in groups based on a passage setting out a real-life situation. A total of about 390 minutes of test items were covered, with different students taking different combinations of test items.
- Students answered a background questionnaire, which took 30 minutes to complete, that sought information about themselves, their homes and their school and learning experiences. School principals were given a questionnaire, to complete in 30 minutes, that covered the school system and the learning environment. In some countries and economies, optional questionnaires were distributed to parents, who were asked to provide information on their perceptions of and involvement in their child's school, their support for learning in the home, and their child's career expectations, particularly in mathematics. Countries and economies could choose two other optional questionnaires for students: one asked students about their familiarity with and use of information and communication technologies, and the second sought information about their education to date, including any interruptions in their schooling and whether and how they are preparing for a future career.


## WHO ARE THE PISA STUDENTS?

Differences between countries in the nature and extent of pre-primary education and care, in the age of entry into formal schooling, in the structure of the school system, and in the prevalence of grade repetition mean that school grade levels are often not good indicators of where students are in their cognitive development. To better compare student performance internationally, PISA targets a specific age of students. PISA students are aged between 15 years 3 months and 16 years 2 months at the time of the assessment, and have completed at least 6 years of formal schooling. They can be enrolled in any type of institution, participate in full-time or part-time education, in academic or vocational programmes, and attend public or private schools or foreign schools within the country or economy. (For an operational definition of this target population, see Annex A2.) Using this age across countries and over time allows PISA to compare consistently the knowledge and skills of individuals born in the same year who are still in school at age 15, despite the diversity of their education histories in and outside of school.

The population of participating students is defined by strict technical standards, as are the students who are excluded from participating (see Annex A2). The overall exclusion rate within a country was required to be below $5 \%$ to ensure that, under reasonable assumptions, any distortions in national mean scores would remain within plus or minus 5 score points, i.e. typically within the order of magnitude of 2 standard errors of sampling. Exclusion could take place either through the schools that participated or the students who participated within schools (see Annex A2, Tables A2.1 and A2.2).

There are several reasons why a school or a student could be excluded from PISA. Schools might be excluded because they are situated in remote regions and are inaccessible, because they are very small, or because of organisational or operational factors that precluded participation. Students might be excluded because of intellectual disability or limited proficiency in the language of the assessment.

In 28 out of the 65 countries and economies participating in PISA 2012, the percentage of school-level exclusions amounted to less than $1 \%$; it was less than $5 \%$ in all countries. When the exclusion of students who met the internationally established exclusion criteria is also taken into account, the exclusion rates increase slightly. However, the overall exclusion rate remains below $2 \%$ in 30 participating countries and economies, below $5 \%$ in 57 participating countries and economies, and below $7 \%$ in all countries except Luxembourg ( $8.4 \%$ ). In 11 out of the 34 OECD countries, the percentage of school-level exclusions amounted to less than $1 \%$ and was less than $3 \%$ in 30 OECD countries. When student exclusions within schools were also taken into account, there were 11 OECD countries below $2 \%$ and 26 OECD countries below $5 \%$.
(For more detailed information about the restrictions on the level of exclusions in PISA 2012, see Annex A2.)

## WHAT KINDS OF RESULTS DOES THE TEST PROVIDE?

The PISA assessment provides three main types of outcomes:

- basic indicators that provide a baseline profile of students' knowledge and skills;
- indicators that show how skills relate to important demographic, social, economic and educational variables; and
- indicators on trends that show changes in student performance and in the relationships between student-level and school-level variables and outcomes.

Although indicators can highlight important issues, they do not provide direct answers to policy questions. To respond to this, PISA also developed a policy-oriented analysis plan that uses the indicators as a basis for policy discussion.

## WHERE CAN YOU FIND THE RESULTS?

This is the fourth of six volumes that present the results from PISA 2012. It begins by examining the relationships between education outcomes and various school and system characteristics, including the use of vertical and horizontal stratification, resource allocation, how the school system is organised and governed, and the learning environment in the school and classroom. Chapter 2 discusses the ways in which students are selected and grouped into certain education levels, grade levels, schools, programmes and different classes within schools based on their performance; Chapter 3 examines the allocation of human, material and financial resources throughout school systems and the amount of time dedicated to instruction and learning; Chapter 4 explores the inter-relationships among school autonomy, school competition, public and private management of schools, school leadership, parental involvement, and assessment and accountability arrangements; and Chapter 5 discusses student- and teacher-related aspects of the learning environment, including student truancy, teacher-student relations, the disciplinary climate and teacher morale. Whenever comparable data are available, trends between 2003 and 2012 are highlighted. Case studies, examining the policy reforms adopted by countries that have improved in PISA, are presented throughout. The concluding chapter discusses the policy implications of the PISA results.

The other five volumes cover the following issues:
Volume I, What Students Know and Can Do: Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science, summarises the performance of students in PISA 2012. It describes how performance is defined, measured and reported, and then provides results from the assessment, showing what students are able to do in mathematics. After a summary of mathematics performance, it examines the ways in which this performance varies on subscales representing different aspects of mathematics literacy. Given that any comparison of the outcomes of education systems needs to take into consideration countries' social and economic circumstances, and the resources they devote to education, the volume also presents the results within countries' economic and social contexts. In addition, the volume examines the relationship between the frequency and intensity of students' exposure to subject content in school, what is known as "opportunity to learn", and student performance. The volume concludes with a description of student results in reading and science. Trends in student performance in mathematics between 2003 and 2012, in reading between 2000 and 2012, and in science between 2006 and 2012 are examined when comparable data are available. Throughout the volume, case studies examine in greater detail the policy reforms adopted by countries that have improved in PISA.

Volume II, Excellence through Equity: Giving Every Student the Chance to Succeed, defines and measures equity in education and analyses how equity in education has evolved across countries and economies between PISA 2003 and 2012. The volume examines the relationship between student performance and socio-economic status, and describes how other individual student characteristics, such as immigrant background and family structure, and school characteristics, such as school location, are associated with socio-economic status and performance. The volume also
reveals differences in how equitably countries allocate resources and opportunities to learn to schools with different socio-economic profiles. Case studies, examining the policy reforms adopted by countries that have improved in PISA, are highlighted throughout the volume.

Volume III, Ready to Learn: Students' Engagement, Drive and Self-Beliefs, explores students' engagement with and at school, their drive and motivation to succeed, and the beliefs they hold about themselves as mathematics learners. The volume identifies the students who are at particular risk of having low levels of engagement in, and holding negative dispositions towards, school in general and mathematics in particular, and how engagement, drive, motivation and self-beliefs are related to mathematics performance. The volume identifies the roles schools can play in shaping the well-being of students and the role parents can play in promoting their children's engagement with and dispositions towards learning. Changes in students' engagement, drive, motivation and self-beliefs between 2003 and 2012, and how those dispositions have changed during the period among particular subgroups of students, notably socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged students, boys and girls, and students at different levels of mathematics proficiency, are examined when comparable data are available. Throughout the volume, case studies examine in greater detail the policy reforms adopted by countries that have improved in PISA.

Volume V, Skills for Life: Student Performance in Problem Solving, presents student performance in the PISA 2012 assessment of problem solving, which measures students' capacity to respond to non-routine situations in order to achieve their potential as constructive and reflective citizens. It provides the rationale for assessing problem-solving skills and describes performance within and across countries and economies. In addition, the volume highlights the relative strengths and weaknesses of each school system and examines how they are related to individual student characteristics, such as gender, immigrant background and socio-economic status. The volume also explores the role of education in fostering problem-solving skills.

Volume VI, Students and Money: Financial Literacy Skills for the 21st Century, examines 15-year-old students' performance in financial literacy in the 18 countries and economies that participated in this optional assessment. It also discusses the relationship of financial literacy to students' and their families' background and to students' mathematics and reading skills. The volume also explores students' access to money and their experience with financial matters. In addition, it provides an overview of the current status of financial education in schools and highlights relevant case studies.

The frameworks for assessing mathematics, reading and science in 2012 are described in PISA 2012 Assessment and Analytical Framework: Mathematics, Reading, Science, Problem Solving and Financial Literacy (OECD, 2013). They are also summarised in this volume.

Technical annexes at the end of this report describe how questionnaire indices were constructed and discuss sampling issues, quality-assurance procedures, the reliability of coding, and the process followed for developing the assessment instruments. Many of the issues covered in the technical annexes are elaborated in greater detail in the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

All data tables referred to in the analysis are included at the end of the respective volume in Annex B1, and a set of additional data tables is available on line (www.pisa.oecd.org). A Reader's Guide is also provided in each volume to aid in interpreting the tables and figures that accompany the report. Data from regions within the participating countries are included in Annex B2.
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# How Resources, Policies and Practices are Related to Education Outcomes 

This chapter examines the relationships between education outcomes and various school and system characteristics, including the use of vertical and horizontal stratification, resource allocation, how the school system is organised and governed, and the learning environment in the school and classroom. Trends in these relationships up to 2012 are also discussed.

This volume focuses on how the organisation of learning environments relates to education outcomes in countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012. As in other organisations, decisions taken at one level in a school system are affected by the context and by decisions taken at other levels (see the PISA 2012 Assessment and Analytical Framework [OECD, 2013a]). For example, what happens in the classroom is influenced by the context and decisions made at the school level; and decisions made at the school level are affected by the context and decisions made at higher levels in school administrations (i.e. districts or national ministries) (Gamoran, Secada and Marrett, 2000). Thus, when analysing the organisational arrangement of school systems it is important to consider the organisation of learning environments at the school and school system levels together.

Data collected through the PISA 2012 student, parent and school questionnaires are used to describe how schools are organised. Some student-level data are aggregated at the school level to approximate school features, and some schoollevel data are aggregated at the system level to approximate system characteristics. School-level data from PISA are complemented by OECD system-level data. ${ }^{1}$

This volume also analyses how the organisation of schools and its relationships with education outcomes have changed over time. Comparisons are made between PISA 2012 and PISA 2003, the last time mathematics was assessed in depth. To account for the extent to which the observed relationships are influenced by the level of economic development of countries and economies, the comparison of school systems discussed in this chapter also considers national income per capita (per capita GDP).

The first chapter examines the relationships between education outcomes and various school and system characteristics. Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 then describe these school and system characteristics in detail: Chapter 2 describes how and when students are distributed across different grade levels, programmes and schools; Chapter 3 focuses on resources invested in education at the system level and examines how resources are allocated across schools within systems; Chapter 4 describes school-governance issues, including school autonomy, school choice, and assessment and accountability arrangements; and Chapter 5 focuses on learning environments at school, examining how these are related to other aspects of school organisation discussed in Chapters 2 through 4.

- Figure IV.1.1

Structure of Volume IV


## What the data tell us

- Stratification in school systems, the result of policies like grade repetition and early selection, is negatively related to equity.
- Among countries and economies whose per capita GDP is more than USD 20 000, including most OECD countries, systems that pay teachers more (i.e. higher teachers' salaries relative to national income) tend to perform better in mathematics.
- High-performing countries and economies tend to allocate resources more equitably across socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.
- School autonomy has a positive relationship with student performance when accountability measures are in place and/or when school principals and teachers collaborate in school management.
- Systems with larger proportions of students who arrive late for school and skip classes tend to show lower overall performance in mathematics.


## PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOL SYSTEMS, SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS

As discussed in Volume I, academic performance among 15-year-old students varies widely, and that variation is related both to individual student characteristics and to the characteristics of schools and school systems in which those students are enrolled.

In the PISA 2012 assessment of mathematics, about half of the variation in student performance is observed between schools and school systems. Figure IV.1.2 shows that among OECD countries, $10 \%$ of the variation in mathematics performance observed among students is attributable to differences in performance among school systems, $36 \%$ is attributable to differences in performance among schools within a country, and $54 \%$ is attributable to differences in performance among students in a school. Among all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, 23\% of the performance variation among students is observed at the system level, $31 \%$ is observed at the school level, and $46 \%$ is observed at the student level.

Figure IV.1.2 -
Variation in mathematics performance between systems, schools and students
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Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database.

This chapter relates features of school organisation and the learning environment to the performance of students within countries and economies and analyses how countries and economies differ in the relationships among these features, overall performance in mathematics, and the level of equity in school systems. The cross-national analyses provide an overview of how system-level attributes and major organisational arrangements relate to student performance and equity in school systems. As always, such relationships require further study in order to determine causality (Box IV.1.1).

## Box IV.1.1. Interpreting the data from students, parents and schools

PISA 2012 asked students and school principals (and, in some countries, parents) to answer questions about the learning environment and organisation of schools, and the social and economic contexts in which learning takes place. Information based on reports from school principals or parents has been weighted so that it reflects the number of 15 -year-olds enrolled in each school. These are self-reports rather than external observations and may be influenced by cultural differences in how individuals respond. For example, students' perceptions of classroom situations may reflect the actual classroom situation imperfectly, or students may choose to respond in a way that does not accurately reflect their genuine thoughts because certain responses may be more socially desirable/acceptable than others.

Several of the indices presented in this volume summarise the responses of students, parents or school principals to a series of related questions. The questions were selected from larger constructs on the basis of theoretical considerations and previous research. Structural equation modelling was used to confirm the theoretically expected dimensions of the indices and validate their comparability across countries. For this purpose, a model was estimated separately for each country or economy and collectively for all OECD countries. For detailed information on the construction of these indices, see Annex A1.

In addition to the general limitation of self-reported data, there are other limitations, particularly those concerning the information collected from principals, that should be taken into account when interpreting the data:

- An average of 346 principals was surveyed in each OECD country, but in 7 countries and economies, fewer than 150 principals were surveyed. In all of these countries and economies, the weighted school participation rate after all replacements is $95 \%$ or higher. In 6 of these 7 countries and economies, this was because fewer than 150 schools were attended by 15 -year-old students.
- Although principals can provide information about their schools, generalising from a single source of information for each school and then matching that information with students' reports is not straightforward. Students' opinions and performance in each subject depend on many factors, including all the education that they have acquired in previous years and their experiences outside the school setting.
- Principals' perceptions may not be the most appropriate sources of some information related to teachers, such as teachers' morale and commitment.
- The learning environment examined by PISA may only partially reflect the learning environment that shaped students' experiences in education earlier in their school careers, particularly in school systems where students progress through different types of educational institutions at the pre-primary, primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels. To the extent that students' current learning environment differs from that of their earlier school years, the contextual data collected by PISA are an imperfect proxy for students' cumulative learning environments, and the effects of those environments on learning outcomes is likely to be underestimated.
- In most cases, 15-year-old students have been in their current school for only two to three years. This means that much of their academic development took place earlier, in other schools, which may have little or no connection with the present school.
- In some countries and economies, the definition of the school in which students are taught is not straightforward because schools vary in the level and purpose of education. For example, in some countries and economies, sub-units within schools (e.g. study programmes, shifts and campuses) were sampled instead of schools as administrative units.

Despite these caveats, information from the school questionnaire provides unique insights into the ways in which national and sub-national authorities seek to realise their education objectives.

In using results from non-experimental data on school performance, such as the PISA Database, it is also important to bear in mind the distinction between school effects and the effects of schooling, particularly when interpreting
the modest association between factors such as school resources, policies and institutional characteristics and student performance. The effect of schooling is the influence on performance of not being schooled compared with being schooled. As a set of well-controlled studies has shown, this can have a significant impact not only on knowledge but also on fundamental cognitive skills (e.g. Ceci, 1991; Blair et al., 2005). School effects are education researchers' shorthand for the effect on academic performance of attending one school or another, usually schools that differ in resources or policies and institutional characteristics. Where schools and school systems do not vary in fundamental ways, the school effect can be modest. Nevertheless, modest school effects should not be confused with a lack of an effect by schooling.

The analyses that relate the performance and equity levels of school systems to education policies and practices are carried out through a correlation analysis. A correlation is a simple statistic that measures the degree to which two variables are associated with each other, but does not prove causality between the two. Since the relationships are in general examined only after accounting for countries' per capita income, omitted variables could be related to these variables and their relationship in a significant way.

Given the nested nature of the PISA sample (students nested in schools that, in turn, are nested in countries), other statistical techniques, such as Hierarchical Linear Models or Structural Equation Modeling may seem more appropriate. Yet, even these sophisticated statistical techniques cannot adequately take into account the nature of the PISA sample for the system-level analyses because participating countries and economies are not randomly selected. The system-level correlations presented here are consistent with results from earlier PISA analyses, which used more sophisticated statistical techniques. Given that the limitations of a correlation analysis using PISA data are not completely overcome by using more sophisticated statistical tools, the simplest method was used. The robustness and sensitivity of the findings are checked against other specifications. Cautionary notes are provided to help the reader correctly interpret the results presented in this volume.

In contrast, the within-system analyses are based on multilevel regression models appropriate for the random sampling of schools and the random sampling of students within these schools.

Comparisons of results between resources, policies and practices and mathematics performance across time (trends analyses) should also be interpreted with caution. Changes in the strength of the relationship between policies and practices and mathematics performance cannot be considered causal because they can occur for two reasons. First, a particular set of resources, policies and practices might have been chosen by higherperforming students or higher-performing schools while lower-performing students/schools did not choose that set of resources, policies and practices. Under this interpretation, the relationship between mathematics performance and resources, policies and practices becomes stronger because higher-performing students and schools choose them. Second, a particular set of resources, policies and practices may have promoted student learning more in 2012 than in 2003. PISA trends data indicates where changes have taken place, but although they cannot provide precise explanations of the nature of the change, trends data shed light on the ways in which a school system is evolving. However, further analysis is needed to unveil the underlying processes (Box IV.1.3 provides more details on interpreting trends analysis results).

## MEASURING THE SUCCESS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS

"Successful" school systems are defined here as those that perform above the OECD average in mathematics (494 points) and in which students' socio-economic status has a weaker-than-average impact on mathematics performance (on average across OECD countries, $14.6 \%$ of the variation in mathematics scores is accounted for by the socio-economic status of students). As shown in Volume II, Australia, Canada, Estonia, Finland, Hong Kong-China, Japan, Korea, Liechtenstein and Macao-China perform at higher levels than the OECD average and also show a weaker relationship between socio-economic status and performance (Figure IV.1.3).

The following sections analyse some of the features shared by these successful school systems that relate to their allocation of resources, policies and practices. The analysis is also extended to the school level within countries, before and after accounting for the socio-economic status of students and schools (Box IV.1.2).

## Student performance and equity



Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Table II．2．1．
StatLink 妍定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957403

## Box IV．1．2．How PISA examines resources，policies，practices and education outcomes

When examining the relationship between education outcomes and resources，policies and practices，this volume takes into account the socio－economic differences among students，schools and school systems．The advantage of doing this lies in comparing similar entities，namely school systems and schools with similar socio－economic profiles．At the same time，there is a risk that such adjusted comparisons underestimate the strength of the relationship between student performance and resources，policies and practices，since most of the differences in performance are often attributable to both policies and socio－economic status．For example，it may be that in better－ performing schools，parents have high expectations for the school and exert pressure on the school to fulfil those expectations．After accounting for socio－economic factors，an existing relationship between parents＇expectations of the school and student performance may no longer be apparent as an independent relationship because these
schools often have an advantaged student population. Even though the relationship between parental expectations and student performance may exist, it is no longer observed, simply because it has been statistically accounted for by the socio-economic differences with which it overlaps.

Conversely, analyses that do not take socio-economic status into account can overstate the relationship between student performance and resources, policies and practices, as the level of resources and the kinds of policies adopted may also relate to the socio-economic profile of students, schools and countries and economies. At the same time, analyses without adjustments may paint a more realistic picture of the schools that parents choose for their children. They may also provide more information for other stakeholders who are interested in the overall performance of students, schools and systems, including any effects that may be related to the socio-economic profile of schools and systems. For example, parents may be primarily interested in a school's absolute performance standards, even if a school's higher achievement record stems partially from the fact that the school has a larger proportion of advantaged students.

The analyses in this volume present relationships both before and after accounting for socio-economic differences, and focus on differences among school systems and among schools within school systems. Unless otherwise noted, comparisons of student performance refer to the performance of students on the mathematics scale.

Relationships between the organisational characteristics of a school system and the school system's performance in PISA, as well as the impact of socio-economic status on performance, are established through a correlational analysis. The analysis is conducted both before and after accounting for the school systems' per capita income (i.e. per capita GDP). The analyses are undertaken first for OECD countries and then for all countries and economies that participated in PISA (Tables IV.1.1, IV.1.2, IV.1.3, IV.1.4 and IV.1.5). ${ }^{2}$

Within school systems, these relationships are established through multilevel regression analysis. In each of the following sections, a set of interrelated resources, policies and practices are considered jointly to establish their relationship with student performance. For the reasons explained above, two approaches are used: an unadjusted approach that examines the relationships as they present themselves to students, families and teachers in the schools, irrespective of the socio-economic context; and a "like-with-like" approach that examines the relationships after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools.

## HOW LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE RELATED TO THE WAYS IN WHICH SCHOOL SYSTEMS SELECT AND GROUP STUDENTS

Volume II highlights the challenges school systems face in addressing the needs of diverse student populations. To meet these challenges, some countries and economies have adopted non-selective and comprehensive school systems that seek to provide all students with similar opportunities, leaving it to each teacher and school to cater to the full range of student abilities, interests and backgrounds. Other countries and economies respond to diversity by grouping students, whether between schools or between classes within schools, with the aim of serving students according to their academic potential and/or interests in specific programmes. Teaching in these schools or classes is adapted to students with different needs; class size and teacher assignments are determined accordingly. Often, the assumption underlying these stratification policies is that students' talents will develop best when students reinforce each other's interest in learning, and create an environment that is more conducive to effective teaching.

The analysis presented in this chapter covers not only curricular differentiation (i.e. tracking or streaming) and school selectivity, but also other forms of horizontal and vertical stratification. Vertical stratification refers to the ways in which students progress through school as they become older. Even though the student population is differentiated into grade levels in practically all schools that participate in PISA, in some countries, all 15 -year-old students attend the same grade level, while in other systems they are dispersed throughout various grade levels as a result of policies governing the age of entrance into the school system and/or grade repetition.

Horizontal stratification refers to differences in instruction within a grade or education level. Horizontal stratification, which can be adopted by the school system or by individual schools, groups students according to their interests and/or performance. School systems make decisions on offering specific programmes (vocational or academic, for example),
setting the age at which students are admitted into these programmes, and determining the extent to which students' academic records are used to select students for their schools. Individual schools make decisions about whether to transfer students out of the school because of poor performance, behavioural problems or special needs, and whether to group students in classes according to ability. Chapter 2 complements this analysis with a detailed description of how different school systems implement these policies and practices and how various forms of stratification are interrelated.

Policies that regulate the selection and sorting of students into schools and classrooms can be related to performance in various ways. On the one hand, creating homogeneous student populations may allow teachers to direct classroom instruction to the specific needs of each group, maximising the learning potential of each group. On the other hand, selecting and sorting students may segregate students according to socio-economic status and result in differences in opportunities to learn. Grouping higher-achieving students together limits the opportunity for under-achieving students to benefit by learning from their higher-achieving peers. In addition, if student sorting is related to teacher sorting, such that high-achieving students are matched to the most talented teachers, under-achieving students may be relegated to lower-quality instruction. Student selection and sorting may also create stereotypes and stigmas that could eventually affect student engagement and learning.

## Vertical stratification

PISA shows that the degree of school systems ${ }^{\prime}$ vertical stratification tends to be negatively related to the equity aspect of education outcomes. In systems where 15 -year-old students are found in different grade levels, the impact of students' socio-economic status on their academic performance is stronger than in systems with less vertical stratification. Across OECD countries, $32 \%$ of the variation in the impact of students' socio-economic status on their mathematics performance can be explained by differences in the degree of vertical stratification within the system, after accounting for per capita GDP (Table IV.1.1). ${ }^{3}$ In contrast, the relationship between vertical stratification and average performance differs between OECD countries on the one hand and across all participating countries and economies on the other. School systems where 15 -year-old students attend a wider range of grade levels tend to have lower overall performance in mathematics, across all participating countries and economies, even after accounting for per capita GDP, ${ }^{4}$ while no clear relationship is observed across OECD countries, where the dispersion of 15 -year-olds across grades is generally less pronounced. To some extent, this is the expected result of a deliberate effort by some countries and economies to make education more inclusive by accommodating students who started school at relatively late ages or who are at greater risk of dropping out.

How is grade repetition related to student performance? The literature suggests that the effect of grade repetition varies, depending on when during their school careers students are retained (Schwerdt and West, 2012). Although some research suggests that grade repetition does not benefit learning (Hauser, 2004; Alexander, Entwisle and Dauber, 2003; Jacob and Lefgren, 2009; Manacorda, 2012), and there is a general understanding that grade repetition is costly for a system (West, 2012; OECD, 2011a), grade repetition is still used in many countries (Goos et al., 2013). Sometimes the prospect of grade repetition, itself, is seen as a source of motivation towards better engagement with school, and is accompanied by other interventions to help a student succeed.

PISA examines the issue of grade repetition not at the individual student level but at the system level in order to avoid selection bias (Heckman and Li, 2003). ${ }^{5}$ Grade repetition tends to be negatively related to equity, and this is especially obvious when the relationship is examined across OECD countries, as shown in Figure IV.1.4. Across OECD countries, $20 \%$ of the variation in the impact of students' socio-economic status on their mathematics performance can be explained by differences in the proportion of students who repeated a grade, even after accounting for per capita GDP. Across OECD countries, grade repetition is unrelated to the system's overall performance; but across all PISA participating countries and economies, systems in which more students have repeated a grade tend to be those that have lower overall performance in mathematics (Table IV.1.1). ${ }^{6}$

Requiring that students repeat grades implies some cost, not only the expense of providing an additional year of education (i.e. direct costs), but also the cost to society in delaying that student's entry into the labour market by at least one year (i.e. opportunity costs) (OECD, 2011a). Among the countries that practice grade repetition and that have relevant data available, in Estonia, Iceland, Ireland and Israel, the direct and opportunity costs of using grade repetition for one age group can be as low as $0.5 \%$ or less of the annual national expenditure on primary- and secondary-school education - or between USD 9300 and USD 35100 per repeater (Figure IV.1.5 and Table IV.1.6). In Belgium and the Netherlands, the cost is equivalent to $10 \%$ or more of the annual national expenditure on primary- and secondary-school education - or as high as USD 48900 per repeater or more. These estimates are based on the assumption that students who repeat grades attain lower secondary education, at most. If they were to attain higher levels of education, the costs would be even greater. ${ }^{7}$

Figure IV.1.4 -
Grade repetition and equity


Note: Grade repetition refers to the percentage of students who have repeated a grade at least once in primary or secondary school.

1. A significant relationship $(p<0.10)$ is shown by the solid line.

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.1.


- Figure IV.1.5

Cost of grade repetition


Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the total annual cost, relative to total expenditure on primary and secondary education. Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.1. 6 and IV.2.2.
StatLink 司int http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

## Horizontal stratification

In general, horizontal stratification is unrelated to a system's average performance. The exception is that systems that group students, within schools, for all classes based on their ability tend to have lower performance across all participating countries and economies, after accounting for per capita GDP (partial correlation coefficient $=-0.25$ ). However, between-school horizontal stratification is negatively related to equity in education opportunities. The impact of the socio-economic status of students and/or schools on performance is stronger in school systems that sort students into different tracks, where students are grouped into different tracks at an early age, where more students attend vocational programmes, where more students attend academically selective schools, or where more students attend schools that transfer low-performing students or students with behaviour problems to another school. Across OECD countries, 39\% of the variation in the impact of socio-economic status of students and schools on students' mathematics performance can be explained by differences in the ages at which students are selected into different programmes, even after accounting for per capita GDP (Table IV.1.1).

The reason why the age at which stratification begins is closely associated with the impact of socio-economic status on performance may be because the frequency and the nature of student selections/transitions differ between early- and late-stratified systems. In systems that stratify students early, students might be selected more than once before the age of 15 . When students are older, more information on individual students is available, and decisions on selecting and sorting students into certain tracks are thus better informed. In addition, students are more dependent upon their parents and their parents' resources when they are younger. In systems that stratify students early, parents with more advantaged socio-economic status may be in a better position to promote their children's chances than disadvantaged parents. In systems where these decisions are taken at a later age, students play a larger role in deciding their own education pathways, and teachers and parents have enough information to make more objective judgements.

As expected, schools that select students for admittance based on students' academic performance tend to show better school average performance, even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics, on average across OECD countries (Table IV.1.12c).

## School admissions policies and mathematics performance

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that "students' records of academic performance" or "recommendations of feeder schools" is "always considered" for admission
$\diamond$ Score-point difference between "always considered" and "sometimes/never considered"
$\triangle \triangleright$ Score-point difference between "always considered" and "sometimes/never considered", after accounting for student socio-economic status
○ ○ Score-point difference between "always considered" and "sometimes/never considered", after accounting for student and school socio-economic status
$\square \square$ Score-point difference between "always considered" and "sometimes/never considered", after accounting for student and school socio-economic status and other school characteristics


Note: White symbols represent differences that are not statistically significant.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the score-point difference in mathematics between students in schools whose principals reported that "students' records of academic performance" or "recommendations of feeder schools" are "always considered" for admission and students in schools where these two factors are "sometimes" or "never considered" for admission.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.1.12c, IV.1.31 and IV.2.7.
StatLink ninist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

However，a school system＇s performance overall is not better if it has a greater proportion of academically selective schools．In fact，in systems with more academically selective schools，the impact of the socio－economic status of students and schools on student performance is stronger（Table IV．1．1）．

## Trends in the relationship between mathematics performance and stratification

With the exception of Brazil and Turkey，in all countries and economies，students who entered primary school at age 5 or younger，or at age 6,7 or 8 or older improved their performance between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 to a similar degree．By contrast，in Brazil and Turkey，performance among students who had started primary school at age 8 or older improved to a greater degree between 2003 and 2012 than that of students who had started school at younger ages （Table IV．1．21）．In Brazil，and as shown in Table IV．2．17（see Chapter 2），more students in 2012 than in 2003 had started school at age 8 or older．Combining these two results suggests that students who would have started school at age 7 in 2003 but did so at age 8 in 2012 were more likely to perform better than students who entered school at age 8 in 2003．It may also be the case that in Turkey students who started school later were more likely to come from socio－economically disadvantaged backgrounds and，as discussed in Volumes I and II，the greatest improvements in performance over the period were observed among low－achieving and disadvantaged students，who are more likely to be those who entered school at a later age in 2012 compared with their counterparts in 2003.
－Figure IV．1．7 ■

## Change between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 in the relationship between grade repetition and mathematics performance

Score－point difference in mathematics performance between students who had repeated a grade and those who hadn＇t


Notes：The change in the score－point difference in mathematics performance between 2003 and 2012 （2012－2003）is shown above the country／economy name．Only statistically significant differences are shown．
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable mathematics scores since 2003.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the score－point difference in mathematics performance between students who reported in 2012 that they had repeated a grade and those who hadn＇t．
Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Table IV．1．22．
StatLink 部定雨 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957403

In PISA 2012，more than $20 \%$ of students in 16 countries and economies reported that they had repeated a grade； 11 of these countries and economies have comparable data for PISA 2003．On average across these 11 countries and economies（Macao－China，Tunisia，Uruguay，Brazil，Belgium，Luxembourg，Portugal，Spain，France，the Netherlands and Germany），in 2003，the difference in mathematics performance between students who had repeated a grade and those who hadn＇t was 90 score points；by 2012，that difference had increased slightly，to 94 score points．This performance advantage among those who had not repeated a grade increased in Macao－China，Luxembourg，Portugal， Spain and France（and also in Sweden and Hungary，two countries with lower grade repetition rates）．In this group of
countries and economies, either the penalty in performance for repeating a grade became larger during the period, or low-achieving students were more likely to have been required to repeat a grade. The performance advantage of non-repeaters decreased in Brazil and Uruguay, where either the adverse effects on performance of repeating a grade weakened during the period, or these school systems held back more students with relatively higher scores in mathematics in 2012 than they did in 2003. Among countries that rely less on grade repetition, the performance advantage increased in Sweden and Hungary and narrowed by more than 10 points in Canada, the United States, Indonesia and Australia (Figure IV.1.7; see also Table IV.2.18 in Chapter 2 for repetition rates).

Trends at different levels of the school system (grade levels or lower/upper secondary, for example) shed light on the extent to which students are more - or less - prepared to enter the next level. Declining trends among 15-year-old students in the 9th grade, for example, may signal an increasing challenge for 10th-grade teachers, as the students they teach now are not as well prepared for 10th-grade coursework as students were a decade ago. Similarly, declining trends in performance among upper secondary students indicate that it is becoming more difficult for school systems to ensure that their students are ready to make the transition into tertiary education or the labour market. On average across OECD countries ${ }^{8}$ and in most other countries and economies, the overall trends in mathematics performance discussed in Volume I are seen in both lower and upper secondary education. In 2012, lower secondary students in Turkey, Brazil, the Russian Federation, Portugal, Mexico, Poland, Thailand, Belgium, Indonesia, Tunisia, Germany and Latvia scored higher in mathematics than did their counterparts in 2003, signalling that lower secondary 15-year-old students were better prepared to enter upper secondary education in 2012 than in 2003. In Portugal, the Russian Federation, Turkey, Italy, Korea and Mexico, 15 -year-olds in upper secondary students in 2012 were better prepared to make the transition into tertiary education or the labour market than their counterparts were in 2003 (Table IV.1.23).

## Box IV.1.3. Trends in the relationship between resources, policies and practices and mathematics performance

Educational resources, policies and practices interact in different ways with students' mathematics performance. The relationship between education policies and practices and students' mathematics performance varies across school systems; it may also vary across time with certain resources, policies or practices becoming more strongly related to mathematics over time. The sections on trends discuss how certain resources, policies and practices have become more strongly - or weakly - related to students' mathematics performance. They compare the strength of the relationship observed in PISA 2003 to that observed in PISA 2012, taking advantage of the fact that many of the resources, policies and practices measured in PISA 2012 were also measured in PISA 2003. These factors include vertical and horizontal stratification practices, learning time and assessment practices. The trends sections in the following chapters describe the ways in which countries and economies have changed their stratification practices (Chapter 2), their level of resources (Chapter 3), their autonomy and assessment/accountability policies (Chapter 4), and their learning environments (Chapter 5). ${ }^{9}$

Changes in the relationship between resources, policies and practices described in this section should be interpreted with caution as they may arise for a variety of reasons. One possible interpretation of the fact that a particular policy or practice has become more strongly related to students' mathematics performance is that it has promoted student learning better in 2012 than in 2003. Alternative explanations are also possible, such as the fact that better-performing students (or schools) may have chosen to adopt this policy during the period, or that lower-performing students (or schools) chose not to. Changes in the relationship between resources, policies and practices and mathematics performance between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 cannot be considered causal. They shed light on ways in which a school system is evolving and need further analysis to reveal the processes and nature of the change. Moreover, because PISA can only show whether the policy or practice has become more or less - strongly related to students' mathematics performance among the particular students, schools and school systems that adopted it, it is not possible to know whether the observed changes can be generalised to include other school systems, schools and students (see endnote 10 for further details on interpreting trends results).

Nonetheless, these changes over time show where certain policies may have become more closely related to student learning. They also highlight where certain challenges to excellence in performance remain or have become more apparent, as in the case of those policies and practices that continue to be related to lower performance or that have become even more strongly associated with poorer mathematics performance.

On average across OECD countries, there was no change in the performance advantage among students in higher grades. In Luxembourg, however, the difference became more pronounced by PISA 2012: in 2003, students in the modal grade outperformed those in the grades below (by an average of 30 score points) and scored lower than those in the grades above (by an average of 80 points); by 2012 these differences had widened significantly to 46 and 89 points, respectively. By contrast, in Belgium, Ireland, Thailand and Australia, these performance differences across grade levels were smaller in 2012 than in 2003 (Table IV.1.23).

On average across OECD countries, the advantage in mathematics performance increased for students in schools that do not use ability grouping compared with students in schools where ability grouping is practiced in some or all classes. Students in schools where no ability grouping is practiced scored eight points higher in mathematics in 2012 compared to their counterparts in 2003, while students in schools where ability grouping is practiced in some or all classes scored lower in PISA 2012 than their counterparts in PISA 2003 did. This could mean that schools that do not group students by ability became more effective than schools that use ability grouping. Alternatively, it could mean that schools that do not group students by ability are increasingly those that select higher-performing students and so appear to have higher average performance than schools that do practice ability grouping. The advantage of schools that do not use ability grouping narrowed in Uruguay and Brazil, where, by 2012, it was no longer statistically significant, and in Luxembourg. The performance advantage among students in schools that do not use ability grouping was observed in PISA 2012, but not in PISA 2003, in Macao-China and Iceland, while the performance disadvantage observed among students who attend schools that do not group students by ability disappeared by 2012 in Turkey and Belgium (Table IV.1.24). ${ }^{11}$

## HOW LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE RELATED TO SYSTEMS' RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Adequate resources are crucial for providing students with high-quality opportunities to learn. At the same time, those resources translate into better learning outcomes only if they are used efficiently. As Chapter 3 shows, school systems in the countries and economies that participated in PISA vary in the amount of resources - including financial, human and material resources and students' learning time - that they invest in education. Research is inconclusive on the subject, but usually shows a weak relationship between the quantity of educational resources and student performance, since more of the variation in performance can be explained by the quality of resources and how these resources are used, particularly among the industrialised countries (Fuller, 1987; Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, 1996; Buchmann and Hannum, 2001; Rivkin, Hanushek and Kain, 2005; Murillo and Román, 2011; Hægeland, Raaum and Salvanes, 2012; Nicoletti and Rabe, 2012).

## Financial resources

A first glance at PISA results gives the impression that high-income countries and economies - and those that are able to and spend more on education - have better student performance. High-income countries and economies (defined here as those with a per capita GDP above USD 20 000) have more resources to spend on education: high-income countries and economies cumulatively spend, on average, USD 89702 on each student from age 6 to 15 , while countries that are not considered to be in that group spend, on average, USD 25286 (Tables IV.3.1 and IV.3.2 discussed in Chapter 3). Moreover, high-income countries and economies have an average mathematics performance almost 70 score points higher than that of countries whose per capita GDP is below the USD 20000 threshold.

Yet the relationship among a country's/economy's income per capita, its level of expenditure on education per student, and its PISA score is far more complex (Baker, Goesling and LeTendre 2002; OECD, 2012). While among countries and economies whose cumulative expenditure per student is below USD 50000 (the level of spending in the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic and Hungary), higher expenditure on education is predictive of higher PISA mathematics scores; however, this is not the case among high-income countries and economies, which include most OECD countries. It seems that for this latter group of countries and economies, factors other than wealth are better predictors of student performance.

Among the former group of countries and economies, systems with a cumulative expenditure of USD 10000 higher than other systems score an average of 27 points higher in the PISA mathematics assessment. For example, Jordan, with a cumulative expenditure per student of USD 7 125, has an average PISA mathematics score of 386 points - 35 points lower than Malaysia, which has a cumulative expenditure per student that is roughly USD 10000 higher than that of Jordan.

However, among those countries and economies whose cumulative expenditure per student is more than USD 50 000, the relationship between spending per student and performance is no longer apparent, even after accounting for differences in purchasing power. Thus, among these countries and economies, it is common to find some with substantially different levels of spending per student yet similar mathematics performance. For example, the United States and the Slovak Republic score at 481 points in mathematics, but the United States' cumulative expenditure per student is more than double that of the Slovak Republic. Also, countries and economies with similar levels of expenditure can perform very differently.


Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown.

1. A significant relationship $(p<0.10)$ is shown by the solid line.
2. A non-significant relationship ( $p>0.10$ ) is shown by the dotted line.

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables I.2.3a and IV.3.1.
StatLink (inlst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

Figure IV.1.9
Change between 2003 and 2012 in average spending per student from the age of 6 to 15 and change in mathematics performance


For example, Italy and Singapore both have a cumulative expenditure per student of roughly USD 85 000, but while Italy scored 485 points in mathematics in PISA 2012, Singapore scored 573 points (Figure IV.1.8).

Trend data between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 shed light on how changes in spending per student relate to changes in performance. ${ }^{12}$ As shown in Figure IV.1.9, the PISA data show no relationship between increases in expenditure and changes in performance, not even for the countries where cumulative expenditure per student was less than USD 50000 in 2003. Mexico, for example, is among the countries and economies with the greatest improvement in average mathematics performance between 2003 and 2012, but its levels of expenditure remained relatively stable between 2001 and 2011. Similar improvements in average mathematics performance were observed in Poland, where per-student cumulative expenditure nearly doubled during the period (Figure IV.1.9). Caution is required when interpreting the change in perstudent expenditure: if the spending is related to capital investment or other purposes that did not change the instructional environment of the 15 -year-olds assessed by PISA, then it would not be expected that the returns to these investments accrue to the students whose performance is measured by PISA. Also, in some countries, an increase in per-student expenditure might be a consequence of a decreasing student population rather than a real increase in investment in education.

Whatever the reason for the lack of a relationship between spending per student and learning outcomes, at least in the countries and economies with larger education budgets, excellence in education requires more than money. How resources are allocated is just as important as the amount of resources available to be allocated. One finding from PISA is that high-performing systems tend to prioritise higher salaries for teachers, especially in high-income countries (Figure IV.1.10).

Figure IV.1.10 -
Teachers' salaries and mathematics performance


[^1]Among countries and economies whose per capita GDP is more than USD 20000 , including most OECD countries, systems that pay teachers more (i.e. higher teachers' salaries relative to national income per capita) tend to perform better in mathematics. The correlation between these two factors across 33 high-income countries and economies is 0.30 , and the correlation is 0.40 across 32 high-income countries and economies excluding Qatar. ${ }^{13}$ In contrast, across countries and economies and economies whose per capita GDP is under USD 20000 , a system's overall academic performance is unrelated to its teachers' salaries, possibly signalling that a host of resources (material infrastructure, instructional materials, transportation, etc.) also need to be improved until they reach a certain threshold, after which improvements in material resources no longer benefit student performance, but improvements in human resources (through higher teachers' salaries, for example) do. ${ }^{14}$

## Human resources

As with spending per student, the mere volume of human resources tends to be unrelated to the academic performance or equity of school systems, after accounting for the level of national income. ${ }^{15}$ Of course, a school system that lacks quality teachers, infrastructure and textbooks will almost certainly perform at lower levels than other systems. In fact, at the school level, teacher shortage appears to be related to poorer performance in most countries. In 33 countries and economies, schools where a higher share of principals reported that teacher shortages hinder learning tend to show lower performance (see Table IV.3.10, in Chapter 3). However, the degree of teacher shortage is related to the amount of other resources allocated to schools and to schools' socio-economic intake. But even after accounting for the socioeconomic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics, in the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Switzerland schools whose principals reported that teacher shortages hinder learning tend to show lower average performance (Table IV.1.12c). On average across OECD countries, almost half of the performance differences between schools are accounted for jointly by school resources and students' and schools' socioeconomic status and demographic profile (Table IV.1.8a). ${ }^{16}$ This suggests that much of the impact of socio-economic status on performance is mediated by the resources invested in schools.

## Material resources

The educational resources available in a school tend to be related to the system's overall performance, while the adequacy of the physical infrastructure appears to be unrelated. After accounting for per capita GDP, 33\% of the variation in mathematics performance across OECD countries can be explained by differences in principals' responses to questions about the adequacy of science laboratory equipment, instructional materials (e.g. textbooks), computers for instruction, Internet connectivity, computer software for instruction, and library materials (Table IV.1.2).

How resources are allocated to disadvantaged and advantaged schools is also related to systems' levels of performance. In higher performing systems, principals in socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools reported similar levels of quality of physical infrastructure and schools' educational resources, both across OECD countries and across all countries and economies participated in PISA 2012 (Table IV.1.3). As shown in Figure IV.1.11, even after accounting for per capita GDP, $30 \%$ of the variation in mathematics performance across OECD countries can be explained by the level of similarities in principals' report on school s' educational resources between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.

At the school level, in 32 countries and economies, principals' perceptions about the adequacy of the educational resources in their school are positively related to the school's average performance (Table IV.3.16, which is discussed in Chapter 3). However, schools with more adequate educational resources are also those that have other characteristics closely related to higher performance. But, even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools and various other school characteristics, in Qatar, Romania and Costa Rica schools with more adequate resources tend to perform better (Table IV.1.12c). This suggests that much of the impact of socio-economic status on performance is mediated by the resources invested in schools (Table IV.1.8a).

## Time resources

The average learning time in regular mathematics lessons is positively related to student performance at the school level. Even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools and various other school characteristics, in 15 countries and economies, schools with longer learning time in mathematics classes tend to perform better in mathematics (Table IV.1.12c). However, at the system level, across all OECD countries and all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 there is no clear pattern between a system's overall mathematics performance and whether students in that system spend more time in regular mathematics classes or not (Table IV.1.2). ${ }^{17}$ Since learning outcomes are the product of both the quantity and the quality of instruction time, this suggests that cross-system differences in the quality of instruction time blur the relationship between the quantity of instruction time and student performance.

Figure IV.1.11
Systems' allocation of educational resources and mathematics performance


Note: Equity in resource allocation refers to the difference in the index of quality of schools' educational resources between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged school.

1. A significant relationship ( $p<0.10$ ) is shown by the solid line

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.3.


Some schools offer supplementary mathematics lessons in addition to those provided during regular school hours. Schools often decide to offer these after-school lessons because their students need more time to learn mathematics. Not surprisingly then, the schools that offer after-school mathematics lessons are often those with lower average performance in mathematics (Tables IV.1.8b, IV.1.8c, IV.1.12b and IV.1.12c). However, at the system level and across all OECD countries and also across all participating countries and economies, the proportion of students in schools with afterschool mathematic lessons tends to be unrelated to the system's overall performance level (Table IV.1.2).

Schools whose students spend more hours on homework or other study set by teachers tend, on average, to perform better, even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics (Tables IV.1.8b, IV.1.8c, IV.1.12b and IV.1.12c). This is not an obvious finding, since one could expect that lower-performing students spend more time doing homework. However, there may be other factors, such as higher-performing schools requiring more homework from their students. At the system level, the average number of hours that students spend on homework or other study set by their teachers tends to be unrelated to systems' overall performance level (Table IV.1.2).

In summary, at the school level, there is some relationship between the time students spend learning in and after school and their performance, but no clear pattern of this relationship is observed at the system level. This might be because of differences across systems in how the time is spent and how much students learn within a given amount of time. In addition, the nature and purpose of after-school lessons are not always the same. In some schools and school systems, after-school lessons are provided mainly to support struggling students, while in others they are mainly for enrichment.

Across all countries and economies, school systems where schools tend to offer more creative extracurricular activities (i.e. band, orchestra or choir; school plays or musicals; and art clubs or art activities) tend to show better overall performance in mathematics, even after accounting for per capita GDP; but this relationship is not observed across OECD countries (Table IV.1.2). In 47 countries and economies, schools that offer more creative extracurricular activities tend to perform better in mathematics (see Table IV.3.31, discussed in Chapter 3). However, the extent to which schools offer these activities is also related to schools' socio-economic profile and other characteristics. But, even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools and various other school characteristics, in Qatar, Viet Nam, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, Jordan, Estonia and Uruguay schools that offer more of these activities tend to perform better in mathematics (Table IV.1.12c) (Box IV.1.4 offers more details on the policies and programmes implemented recently by Israel ${ }^{18}$ ).

As shown in Volume II, students who attended pre-primary education tend to perform better at the age of 15 than those who did not attend pre-primary education. This relationship is also apparent at the school level. In 17 countries and economies, schools with more students who had attended pre-primary education for more than one year tend to show better average performance (Table IV.1.12c). At the system level, across all PISA participating countries and economies, there is also a relationship between the proportion of students who had attended pre-primary education for more than one year and systems' overall performance in mathematics. Some $32 \%$ of the variation in mathematics performance across all countries and economies can be explained by the difference in the percentage of students who attended pre-primary education for more than one year, after accounting for per capita GDP (Table IV.1.2). However, across OECD countries, there is no clear relationship.

## Trends in the relationship between mathematics performance and educational resources

As discussed in Chapter 3, all but 11 countries reduced their student-teacher ratios between 2003 and 2012 (Table IV.3.35). The relationship between the student-teacher ratio and the mathematics performance of schools was weak in 2003 and remained so in 2012. In Tunisia, the negative relationship between student-teacher ratios and performance observed in 2003 - whereby students who attend schools with smaller student-teacher ratios perform better - weakened by 2012. Conversely, the positive relationship between student-teacher ratios and students' mathematics performance - whereby students in schools with more favourable student-teacher ratios actually score lower - strengthened in Italy during the period and remained positive and moderately strong in Liechtenstein, Belgium, the Netherlands and Hong Kong-China. In all other countries and economies, the relationship between the student-teacher ratio and student performance in mathematics was weak in both 2003 and 2012 (Figure IV.1.12).

- Figure IV.1.12


## Change between 2003 and 2012 in the relationship between students' mathematics performance and student-teacher ratios in their schools



Notes: The change in the correlation between mathematics performance and schools' student-teacher ratios between 2003 and 2012 (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable mathematics scores and student-teacher ratios since 2003.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the correlation between students' mathematics performance and the student-teacher ratio in their schools in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.25.
StatLink .intsm http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

Between 2003 and 2012, there was an increase in the amount of time students spend in mathematics classes (see Table IV.3.46 in Chapter 3); yet the relationship between learning time and mathematics performance was weak in both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012: in both PISA assessments, students exposed to more mathematics instruction did not perform better than students exposed to less mathematics instruction. This could be because, in some countries and economies, low-performing students tend to spend more time in mathematics classes to catch up with their peers; in others, higherperforming students may spend more time in mathematics lessons because they enjoy the subject more. In both cases, students may benefit from more time spent in the classroom, but the average relationship is negligible. The relationship was weak and positive in PISA 2003 and became stronger in PISA 2012 in Thailand, Japan and Turkey, meaning that students in these countries who spent more time in mathematics classes performed even better in mathematics in 2012 than their peers did in 2003. This relationship was also positive, but weakened during the period, in Greece and Belgium (Table IV.1.26).

One notable trend concerning educational resources was the widening of the performance gap between students who had attended pre-primary school and those who had not. In 2003, the average advantage in mathematics performance among students who had attended pre-primary education compared to those 15 -year-olds who had not was 40 points; by 2012 the difference had grown to 51 score points. Students who had not attended pre-primary education are at an
increasing disadvantage compared to their peers who had, and this disadvantage widened by more than 25 points in the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, Iceland, Italy, Finland, Spain, Greece, Thailand and Luxembourg. Participation in pre-primary education increased significantly in all of these countries and economies, and by more than five percentage points in Finland, Luxembourg and Portugal (see Table IV.3.50 in Chapter 3), signalling not only that enrolments grew, but that the relationship between attendance and later performance strengthened. In these countries and economies, where the relationship between attendance in pre-primary school and students' mathematics performance grew stronger, attendance in pre-primary school may have improved students' readiness for school or determined students' paths through education to a greater degree in 2012 than it did in 2003.

However, this trend can also signal that, despite an expansion in enrolments in pre-primary programmes, the group of students who do not attend pre-primary schools are increasingly from socio-economically and academically disadvantaged backgrounds. In fact, from 2003 to 2012 there was an increase in the socio-economic disparity between students who had attended pre-primary education and those who had not. This means that the students who could benefit the most from these programmes, those from disadvantaged backgrounds, are those less likely to participate in them. This growing socio-economic divide between students who had attended pre-primary education and those who hadn't is wide in the Slovak Republic and is also observed in Greece, Luxembourg, Poland, Finland, the Russian Federation and Latvia; it narrowed, however, in Macao-China, Germany, Korea, Uruguay and Portugal during the period (Figures IV.1.13 and IV.1.14).

- Figure IV.1.13 -


## Change between 2003 and 2012 in the relationship between students' mathematics performance and their attendance in pre-primary school

Score-point difference in mathematics performance between students who reported that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year and those who hadn't


[^2]
## Change between 2003 and 2012 in the relationship between students' socio-economic status and their attendance at pre-primary school

Index-point difference in the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status between students who reported that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year and those who hadn't


Notes: The change in the index-point difference in the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status performance between 2003 and 2012 (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable values on the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status since 2003. Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the index-point difference in the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status between students who reported in 2012 that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year and those who hadn't.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.27.
StatLink (त्ताड़्य http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

## Box IV.1.4. Improving in PISA: Israel

Israel's performance in PISA has improved in all subject matters. Since PISA 2006, for example, it has improved by an average of 4.2 points per year in mathematics and 2.8 points per year in science; since 2000, the country's score in reading has improved by an average of 3.7 points per year. Average performance in mathematics improved from 442 points in PISA 2006 to 466 points in PISA 2012 and reading performance improved from 452 points in 2000 to 486 points in 2012. At the same time, the proportion of students who score below proficiency Level 2 shrank considerably and the proportion of those who score at or above proficiency Level 5 increased. In 2006, for example, $42 \%$ of students did not attain proficiency Level 2 in mathematics; by 2012, that proportion had decreased to $34 \%$. The share of top performers in mathematics grew from $6 \%$ to $9 \%$ over the same period.

Israel's school system is arranged along six different education streams, reflecting the cultural diversity of the country. Three of these streams cater to the Hebrew-speaking community (secular schools, religious schools and ultra-orthodox schools), and three cater to the Arab-speaking community (schools for the Arab, Druze and Bedouin minorities). For most streams (all but the ultra-orthodox), the Ministry of Education has high capacity to influence and monitor the type and quality of teaching and learning through resource allocation, regulations and guidelines. Only ultra-orthodox schools, which are only partially funded by the state, often do not follow the programmes and policies established by the Ministry.

The Meitzav and the Bagrut are two external evaluations that characterise Israel's education system. The Meitzav assessments are conducted in the second year of primary school (Grade 2), the fifth year of primary school (Grade 5), and the second year of lower-secondary school (Grade 8). The Meitzav assessment is used for system-level evaluation and assesses a quarter of Israel's schools each year in Hebrew or Arabic skills in Grade 2, depending on the language spoken by the child; and also in mathematics, English and science and technology in the Grade 5 and Grade 8 assessments. The Bagrut is the upper secondary exit-level examination, which is also used for university-level admissions, thus having direct consequences for students and a strong influence on what students learn and how they are taught. Students who graduate but do not pass the Bagrut are awarded a certificate of completion of uppersecondary education; those who pass obtain a diploma that allows students to apply to university.

Israel's school system has expanded dramatically in the past 20 years. As a result of a $40 \%$ increase in the 5-24 year-old population between 1990 and 2010, and a change in the composition of the student population (much of the increase in the number of primary and secondary school students has been in the Arab-speaking and ultra-orthodox streams), the Israeli school system has been in constant change.

## Reforms prompted by assessment results

Education policy discussions flourished after participation in international assessments revealed Israel's relatively poor performance and inequitable school system. In PISA 2000, which Israel implemented in 2002 as part of PISA+, for example, Israel performed well below the OECD average in reading, mathematics and science. These policy discussions led to the formation of the Dovrat Committee in 2003 whose aim was to propose reforms and policies to the government to improve both the performance and equity of the school system. Although only some of the recommendations, delivered in 2004, were ultimately implemented, many of the current policies and reforms follow the committee's strategic recommendations. The recommendations included providing universal pre-school from age three, improving the links between pre-primary and primary schools by either organising preschools into clusters or adding pre-school classes to primary schools, lengthening the school day for all students, and re-defining the role of school principals by giving them more responsibilities and higher pay. Following the Dovrat Committee's recommendations, in 2005, the National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation (RAMA) was established to conduct periodic evaluations of the education system and schools, contributing to the process of results-based management at all levels.

Current education policy follows the framework outlined by New Horizons, a programme launched in 2007 that advances reform for pre-primary, primary and lower secondary schools on several fronts and follows an agreement between education authorities and the primary and lower-secondary teachers' union. Initially, it was implemented on a voluntary basis, in schools were a majority of teachers agreed, then became compulsory in the 2009-10 school year. School principals' careers were distinguished from that of teachers. Following the reforms on principals' careers originally laid out by the Dovrat Committee, principals must now have earned a special tertiary-level degree and have been granted more responsibility and autonomy in evaluating teachers. Each school is given a monthly in-service training opportunity; the principal and managerial staff decide how to make the best use of it. Teachers' working hours were increased from 30 to 36 hours per week. In parallel, government policies expanded the duration of compulsory education to Grade 12 and set a maximum class size of 32 students which has been partially implemented, mainly among socio-economically disadvantaged schools. In addition, extra funding was given to primary schools to teach reading, writing and mathematics at the first two years in small groups of 20 students.

## Changes in teachers' pay and working conditions, school support and assessments

In addition, teachers' pay scales were increased and flattened (salaries for junior teachers were doubled, while those for veteran teachers increased by $25 \%$ ) and promotion was made contingent on triennial evaluations and fulfilling the requirement of 60 hours of in-service training per year. These changes to teachers' working conditions sought to improve teacher morale and reduce retention and recruitment problems that stem from the growing student population, the caps on class size, and the expansion of compulsory schooling.

New Horizons also mandates that the increased number of working hours for teachers be focused on small-group teaching for under-performing students. Small-group teaching programmes were piloted in the early 2000s together with cash-reward programmes (although cash-reward programmes for students proved more cost-effective, they did not have broad public support). Other programmes to promote equity focus on the Arab-speaking minorities,
particularly the Bedouin minority. The most recent of these five-year programmes began in 2008 and supports extra hours of study, provides rent assistance for teachers, improves the quality of educational facilities, offers support teams to assist low-performing schools, and strengthens Arabic-language skills. To advance towards greater equity, other policies introduced a socio-economic component in the allocation of resources in primary schools and lower secondary; but only $5 \%$ of the school budget is devoted to this compensatory mechanism.

More recently, Courage to Change policies outlines the framework for reform in upper secondary schools. In conjunction with New Horizons, Courage to Change allows schools that offer lower and upper secondary education to take part in the reforms. Courage to Change was signed in 2012 and the policies are set to be implemented gradually so that full implementation is expected by 2015.

Other programmes have sought to attract university-level graduates into the teaching profession in general and to science areas in particular. In Academics for Teaching, participants undergo an intensive teacher-training programme (no tuition fees and a monthly allowance), and teach full time with a commitment to teach for three years. They receive a normal teachers' salary in addition to a supplement, and after the three years they can enrol, for free, in a master's degree in return for an additional two years' commitment. Other programmes to attract individuals to the teaching profession are Outstanding Achievers for Education (to attract students with good performance at the tertiary level), Teach First (to promote teaching as an interim career move following graduation from university), Educational Pioneer (to encourage those already working with youth in other contexts to become teachers), and the Atidim programme (to encourage English and science teachers to work in remote and disadvantaged areas).

In 2007, the schedule of the Meitzav assessment was converted to a new biennial-rotating, so that individual schools are assessed every two years and on a particular subject every four years with system-level results available annually based on a quarter of the country's schools. In the years where a particular subject is not assessed in a particular school, individual schools implement, internally, a version of the Meitzav which come with supporting pedagogical material. The internal Meitzav is graded internally by the teachers and results are not reported to an external entity. Changes to the Bagrut examination have shifted the weight given to questions that can be answered by rote learning so that more space is given to projects that require students' individual inquiry, sending a strong signal to secondary schools about the competencies that students should have acquired by the end of compulsory education.

Note: The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.
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## HOW LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE RELATED TO THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION SYSTEMS

## School autonomy

Since the early 1980s, school reforms have focused on giving schools greater autonomy over a wide range of institutional operations in an effort to raise performance levels (Whitty, 1997; Carnoy, 2000; Clark, 2009; Machin and Vernoit, 2011). More decision-making responsibility and accountability has devolved to school principals, and, in some cases, management responsibilities have devolved to teachers or department heads. Schools have become increasingly responsible for curricular and instructional decisions as well as for managing financial and material resources and personnel. These reforms are adopted on the premise that schools themselves are more knowledgeable about their own needs and the most effective ways to allocate resources and design the curriculum so that they can better meet the needs of their students.


PISA shows that school systems that grant more autonomy to schools to define and elaborate their curricula and assessments tend to perform better than systems that don't grant such autonomy, even after accounting for countries' national income (Figure IV.1.15). School systems that provide schools with greater discretion in deciding studentassessment policies, the courses offered, the content of those courses and the textbooks used are also school systems that perform at higher levels in mathematics. In contrast, greater responsibility in managing resources appears to be unrelated to a school system's overall performance (Table IV.1.4).

The positive relationship between schools' autonomy in defining and elaborating curricula and assessment policies and student performance that is observed at the level of the school system can play out differently within countries and economies. In 17 countries and economies, schools that have more autonomy in this area tend to perform better, while the opposite is observed in seven countries and economies (Table IV.4.3, discussed in Chapter 4). The degree of school autonomy is also related to the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics, such as whether the school is public or private. But even after accounting for all of these aspects, a positive relationship is observed in Costa Rica, Thailand, Latvia and Finland (Table IV.1.12c).

Within systems too, there is a relationship between school autonomy and learning outcomes, but this relationship interacts with the accountability arrangements of school systems. For example, information on the results of external examinations and assessments often provide a basis on which schools and parents can make informed and appropriate decisions for students (Fuchs and Woessmann, 2007). Data from PISA 2012 show that in systems where a greater share of schools post achievement data publicly, considered here as one form of accountability, there is a positive relationship between school autonomy in resource allocation and student performance. The first panel in Figure IV.1.16 shows that, in the participating countries and economies where schools do not post achievement data publicly, after students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profile are taken into account, a student who attends a school with greater autonomy in defining and elaborating curricula and assessment policies tends to perform seven points lower in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy in these areas.

Figure IV.1.16
School autonomy and mathematics performance, by system-level accountability features
Predicted score-point difference in mathematics performance between students in schools with more autonomy and those in schools with less autonomy (more - less)


[^3]In contrast，in a school system where all schools post achievement data publicly，a student who attends a school with greater autonomy scores seven points higher in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy． A similar interaction between school autonomy in resource allocation and a system＇s accountability arrangements， particularly those of posting achievement data publicly，is observed；however the performance advantage for schools with greater autonomy in this regard is relatively small（Table IV．1．13）．

Similar interactions between school autonomy and system－level accountability are observed when system accountability takes the form of a standardised policy for mathematics，such as a school curriculum with shared instructional materials accompanied by staff development and training．The right panel of Figure IV．1．16 shows that the relationship between school autonomy in defining and elaborating curricula and assessment policies and school average performance in mathematics is influenced by the extent to which systems have a standardised policy for mathematics．In OECD countries where no school implements a standardised policy for mathematics，a student who attends a school with greater autonomy in curricula and assessments tends to score nine points lower in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy．In contrast，in a school system where all students are in schools that implement such a standardised policy，a student who attends a school with greater autonomy scores five points higher in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy（Table IV．1．14）．

The relationship between school autonomy and performance also appears to be affected by whether there is a culture of collaboration between teachers and principals in managing a school．Figure IV．1．17 shows that，in school systems where principals reported less teacher participation in school management（i．e． 1.5 index points lower than the OECD average）， even after students＇and schools＇socio－economic status and demographic profile are taken into account，a student who attends a school with greater autonomy in allocating resources tends to score 17 points lower in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy．In contrast，in a school system where principals reported more teacher participation in school management（i．e． 1.5 index points higher than the OECD average），a student who attends a school with greater autonomy scores 9 points higher in mathematics than a student who attends a school with less autonomy（Table IV．1．15）．
－Figure IV．1．17
School autonomy and mathematics performance，by system－level teacher participation in school management
Predicted score－point difference in mathematics performance between students in schools with more autonomy and those in schools with less autonomy（more－less）


[^4]
## School competition

Since the early 1980s, reforms in many countries have also granted parents and students greater choice in the school the students will attend. Students and their families are granted the freedom to seek and attend the school that best serves students' education needs; that, in turn, introduces a level of competition among schools to attract students. Assuming that students and parents have all the required information about schools and choose schools based on academic criteria, the competition creates incentives for institutions to organise programmes and teaching in ways that better meet diverse student requirements and interests, reducing the costs of failure and mismatches.

Yet some of the assumptions underlying such reforms have been called into question (Schneider, Teske and Marshall, 2002; Hess and Loveless, 2005; Berends and Zottola, 2009). It is unclear, for example, whether parents have the necessary information to choose the best schools for their children. It is also unclear whether parents always give sufficient priority to high achievement, at the school level, when making these choices (see Chapter 4). School choice may also lead to the unintended racial/ethnic or socio-economic segregation of schools (Gewirtz, Ball and Rowe, 1995; Whitty, 1998; Karsten, 1999; Viteritti, 1999; Schneider and Buckley, 2002; Plank and Sykes, 2003; Hsieh, 2006; Heyneman, 2009; Bunar, 2010a; Bunar, 2010b; Söderström and Uusitalo, 2010). Recently, in some school systems greater responsibility for assigning students to schools is given to the education authority (see Box IV.4.2 as an example in Belgium [French community]).

The degree of competition among schools is one way to measure school choice. Competition among schools is intended to provide incentives for schools to innovate and create more effective learning environments. Systemlevel correlations in PISA do not show a relationship between the degree of competition and student performance (Table IV.1.4). At the school level, in 28 countries and economies, schools that compete for student enrolment with other schools tend to show better performance, before accounting for schools' socio-economic intake. In seven countries and economies, schools whose socio-economic intake is more advantaged are also more likely to compete with other schools for students (Table IV.1.16). Only in the Czech Republic and Estonia do schools that compete with other schools for students in the same area tend to perform better, on average, than schools that do not compete, after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics (Table IV.1.12c).

On the other hand, the results indicate a weak and negative relationship between the degree of competition and equity. Among OECD countries, systems with more competition among schools tend to show a stronger impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance in mathematics. Caution is advised when interpreting this result, as the observed relationship could be affected by a few outliers. ${ }^{19}$ But, this finding is consistent with research showing that school choice - and, by extension, school competition - is related to greater levels of segregation in the school system, which may have adverse consequences for equity in learning opportunities and outcomes.

## Public and private stakeholders

The evidence on the impact of public and private funding and management on student performance is mixed. Cross-country studies conducted by Woessmann (2006) based on the PISA 2000 assessment, and by Woessmann, et al. (2009) and West and Woessmann (2010), based on the PISA 2003 assessment, concluded that countries that combine private management and public funding tend to produce better overall academic performance. Studies in Chile (Lara, Mizala and Repetto, 2009), the Czech Republic (Filer and Münich, 2003), Sweden (Sandström and Bergström, 2005), the United Kingdom (Green et al., 2011) and the United States (Couch, Shugart and Williams, 1993; Peterson et al., 2003) show that larger proportions of private school enrolments are related to better performance, based on cross-sectional or longitudinal data or the data before and after structural changes. But the debate on performance is far from conclusive, as other studies report little, negative or insignificant effects, and the results often depend on methodological choices. For example, other studies based on state-level data from the United States concluded that higher private school enrolment is not significantly related to performance (Wrinkle et al., 1999; Sander, 1999; Geller, Sjoquist and Walker, 2006). A few studies show small negative effects (Smith and Meier, 1995), negative effects for low-income districts (Maranto, Milliman and Scott, 2000), or that the relationship depends on the education outcome that is measured (Greene and Kang, 2004).

Across OECD countries and all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, the percentage of students enrolled in private schools is not related to a system's overall performance (Table IV.1.4).

Figure IV.1.18
School competition and mathematics performance


Note: School competition refers to the percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that one or more schools compete for students in the same area.

1. A non-significant relationship ( $p>0.10$ ) is shown by the dotted line.

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.4.


Figure IV.1.19
School type and mathematics performance


Note: White symbols represent differences that are not statistically significant.

1. Schools that are directly controlled or managed by: a public education authority or agency; or a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools that receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools that receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the score-point difference in mathematics performance between public and private schools (government-dependent and government-independent schools combined).
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.7.
StatLink 勈页 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

At the school level, when average performance is compared simply between public and private schools, without accounting for background aspects, private schools tend to show better performance than public schools in 28 countries and economies (Figure IV.1.19 and Table IV.4.7 in Chapter 4). The score-point difference ranges from 12 points in Ireland to 108 points - or the equivalent of nearly three years of schooling - in Qatar. By contrast, in Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong-China, Thailand and Luxembourg, the average score among public schools is higher than that among private schools by 13 to 60 points. The proportion of students in private schools is unrelated to the magnitude of the difference in performance between students who attend private and public schools. ${ }^{20}$ Students who attend private schools tend to be more socio-economically advantaged than students who attend public schools. Thus, after accounting for the socio-economic status of students and schools, private schools outperform public schools in only 13 countries and economies, and public schools outperform private schools in eight countries and economies (Table IV.4.7). In addition, after accounting for the demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics, private schools outperform public schools in 10 countries and economies, while public schools show better average performance than private schools in five countries and economies (Table IV.1.12c).

## Assessment and accountability

Tests that have direct and high-stakes consequences for students can serve as powerful incentives for students to put greater effort into learning. For teachers, student-based standardised assessments provide a way to compare the performance of their students to performance achieved elsewhere in the school systems and can also be used to customise pedagogy accordingly. At the school level, achievement data can be used to determine how resources and additional support are allocated and/or may trigger intervention by higher authorities. Achievement data can also be used to inform policies to create more efficient learning environments and to prompt schools, teachers and the students themselves to work towards centrally established education outcomes.

Critics of the use of standardised tests based on students' test performance rather than on improvements in test scores argue that standardised tests may reinforce the advantages of schools that serve students from socio-economically advantaged backgrounds (Ladd and Walsh, 2002; Downey, Von Hippel and Hughes, 2008). In addition, teachers may respond strategically to accountability measures by sorting out or retaining disadvantaged students (Jacob, 2005; Jennings, 2005). Standardised tests might have the adverse effect of limiting school goals to passing or proficiency on particular tests and focusing instruction on those students who are close to average proficiency and ignoring those who are far below or above the average ( Neal and Schanzenback, 2010).

In order to avoid the negative impact of "teaching to the test," evaluations are expanding and becoming more diverse in most OECD countries. Countries do not solely focus on student assessments; they also evaluate schools and appraise teachers and school leaders. All school staff and students need to be engaged in a broader range of evaluation exercises, targeting both schools and teachers; student feedback is an important contribution to be used for formative purposes (OECD, 2013b).

PISA shows that the degree to which systems seek feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources tends to be related to systems' level of equity. PISA 2012 asked school principals to report whether written feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources is sought for quality-assurance and improvement of the school. Systems where more students attend schools with such practices tend to show less impact of student socio-economic status on performance. This is observed across OECD countries and across all participating countries and economies. As shown in Figure IV.1.20, across OECD countries, some $10 \%$ of the variation in the impact of students' socio-economic status on their mathematics performance can be accounted for by differences in the degree to which systems use this approach, after accounting for per capita GDP (Table IV.1.4). Systems seeking written feedback from students also tend to perform better across OECD countries. ${ }^{21}$

At the school level, on average across OECD countries, schools seeking written feedback from students tend to perform better, even after accounting for the socio-economic status of students and schools (Table IV.1.18). However, this relationship also varies by country/economy. After accounting for the socio-economic status of students and schools, in Switzerland, Belgium, Mexico, Portugal, Colombia and Macao-China, schools with higher average performance tend to use this approach, while in Qatar, New Zealand, Shanghai-China and Montenegro, schools with lower average performance tend to do so (Table IV.1.18). After accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics, in Viet Nam and Colombia schools with better average performance tend to use this practice, while in Qatar, New Zealand, Croatia and Chile, the opposite is observed (Table IV.1.12c).

Figure IV.1.20
Written feedback from students and equity


Note: Seeking written feedback from students refers to the percentage of students in school whose principal reported that written feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources is sought for quality assurance and improvement of schools.

1. A significant relationship ( $p<0.10$ ) is shown by the solid line.
2. A non-significant relationship ( $p>0.10$ ) is shown by the dotted line.

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.4.
StatLink 鬲可 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957403

Systems with poorer overall performance tend to be those where more students are in schools whose principals reported that achievement data are tracked over time by an administrative authority. This observation holds across OECD countries and across all participating countries and economies (Table IV.1.4). This relationship is also observed at the school level in Qatar, Korea, Albania and Shanghai-China (Table IV.1.12c). In these countries and economies, schools with lower average performance tend to be those where an administrative authority tracks their achievement data over time. This negative relationship may reflect the fact that low-performing schools or systems use this practice in order to monitor school performance and hold lower-performing schools accountable. Indeed, systems where this practice is more common tend to have greater equity in education opportunities. Systems where more principals reported their achievement data are tracked over time by an administrative authority tend to show a weaker impact of the socio-economic status of students and schools on student performance in mathematics (Table IV.1.4). ${ }^{22}$

Across all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, but not across OECD countries, the extent to which schools provide an opportunity for teacher mentoring is related to equity. In the systems where more schools provide teacher mentoring, students' socio-economic status has less impact on their performance, both before and after accounting for per capita GDP (Table IV.1.4).

The analysis above has shown that system-level policies through which schools post results publicly interact with school autonomy in ways that yield better student performance. When looking at these policies in isolation at the school level, schools that post achievement data publicly perform higher in 21 countries and economies (Tables IV.1.17). But, after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools, no relationship is observed in most countries and economies (Table IV.1.12c).

## Trends in the relationship between mathematics performance and school governance

Chapter 3 highlights how, in some countries and economies, the relative enrolment in public schools has increased while in others it has declined, but on average across OECD countries, the share of students attending public and private schools remained stable between 2003 and 2012. In PISA 2003, students in private schools outperformed students in public schools by 19 points in mathematics, but this difference was not observed when comparing students with similar socio-economic status. In fact, after comparing students of similar socio-economic status who attend schools with a similar socio-economic profile, students in public schools outperformed their peers in private schools by 14 points in mathematics (Table IV.4.19).

Between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 all these differences shifted in favour of students in private schools. The overall difference in performance between public and private school students across OECD countries widened by nine points (up to 28 points in favour of students in private schools); after accounting for students of similar socio-economic status, the difference, which was not significant in 2003, was 11 points in favour of private-school students in 2012. However, after accounting for students of similar socio-economic status who attend schools with similar socio-economic profiles, the public-school advantage remained, but narrowed to nine score points. ${ }^{23}$

During the same period, the performance gap between private and public schools narrowed in Brazil, Ireland, Mexico and Thailand, either before or after accounting for students' socio-economic status. In Ireland, the difference in mathematics performance between students in public and private schools narrowed by 18 points, and by 2012 was one of the smallest among OECD countries, although it remains statistically significant. This trend is largely explained by the change in the socio-economic status of the students attending both types of schools. In Thailand, there was no performance gap between the two types of schools in 2003; but in 2012, public schools outperformed private schools by more than 30 score points - and this difference holds even when comparing students and schools of similar socio-economic status. In Mexico and Brazil, the performance of students in public schools also improved relative to that of students with similar socio-economic status who attend private schools. The socio-economic status of students in public schools has increased in Korea and Ireland. In 2003, students in public schools came from lower socio-economic backgrounds than students in private schools, on average. But by 2012, students in public and private schools had similar socio-economic status. In Ireland, the proportion of students from relatively advantaged socio-economic backgrounds who attended public schools grew so significantly over the period that by 2012 the socio-economic disadvantage associated with public schools was among the lowest in Ireland among all OECD countries (Figure IV.1.21 and Table IV.4.19).

- Figure IV.1.21 ■

Change between 2003 and 2012 in the relationship between students' mathematics performance and their attendance in private or public schools, after accounting for socio-economic status
Score-point difference in mathematics performance between students in public and private schools, after accounting for students' PISA index of economic, social and cultural status


Notes: The change in the score-point difference in mathematics performance between 2003 and 2012 (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable mathematics scores and attendance in private and public schools since 2003.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the score-point difference in mathematics performance between public and private schools, after accounting for students' PISA index of economic, social and cultural status in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.19.


## HOW LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE RELATED TO SYSTEMS' LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

The results from earlier PISA assessments showed that students who are in a school climate characterised by high expectations, classrooms conducive to learning, and good teacher-student relations tend to perform better than those who are not. Building on these findings, this chapter examines disciplinary climate, teacher-student relations, teacherrelated factors affecting school climate, student-related factors affecting school climate, students' sense of belonging, teacher morale, and the level of student truancy, including arriving late for school, skipping school and dropping out.

Research studying effective schools suggests a strong relationship between the quality of the learning environment and both student performance and the level of equity in the school system. Students learn more in schools that provide an orderly environment, where students feel supported by teachers, and that enjoy clearly articulated leadership by the principal, for example (Scheerens and Bosker 1997). Research also has shown that most of the variation in learning environments is found between classes or courses rather than between schools. As these differences at the classroom levels are included in within-school variation in the analyses based on PISA data, caution is advised when interpreting results.

Studies of effective schools find that a school culture that prioritises high academic achievement is positively related to student achievement. In such an environment, characterised by amiable and supportive teacher-student relationships that extends beyond the boundaries of the classroom, the values held by both teachers and students are clear. In these schools, academic activities and student performance are considered central to the success of the school (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Sammons, 1999; Taylor, Pressley and Pearson, 2002).

## Student truancy

Student truancy tends to be negatively related to systems' overall performance. Among OECD countries, after accounting for per capita GDP, systems with higher percentages of students who arrive late for school tend to have lower scores in mathematics, and systems with higher percentages of students who skip school also tend to score lower in mathematics.

Figure IV.1.22

## Students skipping school and mathematics performance



Note: Students skipping school refers to the percentage of students who had skipped a class or a day of school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test.

1. A significant relationship ( $p<0.10$ ) is shown by the solid line.

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.5.


Among all countries and economies, after accounting for per capita GDP, systems with larger proportions of students who arrive late for school and skip classes tend to show lower overall performance (Table IV.1.5). As shown in Figure IV.1.22, after accounting for per capita GDP, $16 \%$ of the variation in mathematics performance across OECD countries can be explained by differences in the proportion of students who skip school. A similar result is observed among all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012.

This negative relationship is also observed at the school level. In 29 countries and economies, schools with more students who arrive late for school tend to show lower average performance as do schools with more students who skip school. In Korea, Japan, Chinese Taipei, the Netherlands, Croatia, Slovenia, Viet Nam and New Zealand, a 10 percentage-point increase of such students corresponds to a decrease in average school performance of between 10 and 34 points, after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics (Table IV.1.12c). In Korea and Japan, a 10 percentage-point increase in such students corresponds to a drop in average school performance of 25 points and 22 points, respectively. In these countries, an below-OECD-average proportion of students attends schools where over $10 \%$ of students skipped a day or a class at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test, ( $9 \%$ in Korea and $7 \%$ in Japan, while the OECD average proportion is $73 \%$ ) (see Table IV.5.4, which is discussed in Chapter 5).

## School climate

Disciplinary climate is also consistently related to higher average performance at the school level. In 48 participating countries and economies, schools with better average performance tend to have a more positive disciplinary climate, even after accounting for the socio-economic status and demographic background of students and schools and various other school characteristics (Table IV.1.12c). In-depth analysis of schools' disciplinary climates and other school features in Chapter 5 shows that, in almost all countries and economies, a school's average disciplinary climate is related to the average socio-economic status of its student population, but it is also related to other school features as well. On average across OECD countries, school size, school location, school type, and the incidence of teacher shortage are related to a school's disciplinary climate, even after accounting for all other school features (see Table IV.5.13 in Chapter 5).

## Trends in the relationship between mathematics performance and the learning environment

Among OECD countries, the performance disadvantage among students who reported that they arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA assessment was significantly larger in 2012 than it was in 2003. In 2003 students who had arrived late for school scored an average of 23 points lower than students who had not arrived late; by 2012, this difference had grown to 27 points. This disadvantage grew significantly, and by more than 10 score points, in the Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Korea, the Slovak Republic, Canada and Ireland. In these countries and economies either the performance disadvantage associated with arriving late for school grew, or students who had arrived late for school were increasingly those who were low achievers. To the extent it is the latter association, the performance disadvantage related to arriving late for school grew because lowachieving students were more likely to have arrived late. If it's the case that low-achieving students are becoming more likely to arrive late, then it's precisely the group of students that would benefit the most from enhanced engagement with school that is arriving late and showing signs of disengagement with school. In Belgium, Turkey, Uruguay and Latvia, the performance difference between students who had arrived late for school and those who had not shrank (Table IV.1.28).

The proportion of students in a school who reported arriving late for school gives some indication of the learning environment. In both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, students in schools with a larger concentration of students who reported to have arrived late performed worse than students in schools with a smaller proportion of students who reported so. But between 2003 and 2012 the performance disadvantage worsened among students who attended schools with a larger concentration of students who reported to have arrived late. In 2003 and on average across OECD countries, students in schools where more than one in four of their peers reported to have arrived late scored 18 points lower on the PISA mathematics assessment than students in schools where fewer than one in four of their peers so reported; by 2012, this performance difference grew significantly to 26 points. This could mean that, in 2012, a large concentration of students who had arrived late for school disrupted student learning to a greater extent than in 2003, or that schools with a higher concentration of students who had arrived late were enrolling more lower-achieving students. Whatever the reason, lower-achieving schools were more likely in 2012 than in 2003 to have learning climates that were not as conducive to learning (Table IV.1.29).

## HOW THE FEATURES OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS ARE INTERRELATED

Many of the aspects related to the organisation of school systems are closely interrelated. Figure IV.1.23 shows the relationship between school organisation and aspects of the learning environment. The aspects included in this figures are those that show a significant relationship, ${ }^{24}$ either with performance or equity (i.e. the strength of the relationship between student socio-economic status and performance in mathematics), both across OECD countries and across all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012.

Across OECD countries, two inter-related aspects of vertical stratification (the variation in grade levels in which 15 -year-old students are enrolled, and the percentage of students who repeated one or more grades) are negatively related to school autonomy in curricula and assessments. This means that comprehensive systems that have to manage heterogeneous student populations within schools grant greater autonomy to schools to determine course content and assessment policies (Figure IV.1.23 and Table IV.1.19).

School systems that grant more discretion to schools to determine curricula and assessment policies tend to be those with fewer students who skip school. This relationship is observed both across OECD countries and across all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 (Figure IV.1.23 and Tables IV.1.19 and IV.1.20).

In summary, when all the indicators listed in Figure IV.1.23 and per capita GDP are related to a school system's overall performance, around $60 \%$ of the variation in performance across OECD countries is accounted for. Across all PISAparticipating countries and economies, these system characteristics together with national income account for around $75 \%$ of the variation across school systems.

At the school level, after considering the socio-economic and demographic profile of students and schools as well as school organisation and the learning environment, across OECD countries, an average of $87 \%$ of the betweenschool variation in mathematics performance can be explained by the aspects measured by PISA (Figure IV.1.24 and Table IV.1.12a). Almost a quarter of the performance variation between schools is solely accounted for by aspects of school organisation and the learning environment measured by PISA, independent of the effect of the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools. As school organisation and the learning environment are related to the socio-economic status and demographic profile of students and schools, about half of the between-school variation in performance is explained by these factors combined.

## Box IV.1.5. How to interpret the figures

Figure IV.1.24 shows the extent to which variation in student performance is related to a particular school characteristic. The values that underlie the figures are extracted from Table IV.1.12a. The total length of the bar represents between-school variation in student performance for each country. The longer the bar, the greater the differences in student performance among schools.

Figure IV.1.24 considers the extent to which between-school variation can be explained by differences in schools' policies, practices, resources and the learning environment, either independently of students' and schools' socioeconomic status and demographic profile (light blue) or jointly with those factors (dark blue). This means that the total length of the two sections (light blue and dark blue combined) present the overall variation attributable to schools' policies, practices, resources and the learning environment.

The variation jointly accounted for by both schools' policies, practices, resources and the learning environment, and students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profile (dark blue) indicates the extent to which school policies, practices, resources and the learning environment are inequitably distributed according to students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profiles.

The figure also shows the amount of variation attributable to socio-economic status and demographic background independent of schools' policies, practices, resources and the learning environment (light grey), and the amount of variation that is not attributable either to socio-economic and demographic background or to schools' policies, practices, resources and the learning environment (dark grey).

The variation in performance is presented as a percentage of the average variation in student performance across OECD countries, so that performance differences can be compared across all participating countries and economies. The OECD average variation in student performance is set to $100 \%$.
－Figure IV．1．23
Relationship between selected policy，practice and resource indicators

## Correlation coefficients between two relevant measures

Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 （i．e．a perfect negative linear association）to +1.00 （i．e．a perfect positive linear association）． When a correlation coefficient is 0 ，there is no linear relationship between the two measures．


Notes：Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level（ $p<0.10$ ）are indicated in italics and at the $5 \%$ level（ $p<0.05$ ）are in bold． X indicates that the Pearson＇s correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman＇s rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level．Inequity refers to variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of students．Correlations with mathematics performance and inequity are partial correlation coefficients after accounting for per capita GDP．
1．Weighted average of upper and lower secondary school teachers．The average is computed by weighting teachers＇salaries for upper and lower secondary school according to the respective 15 －year－old students＇enrolment（for countries and economies with available information on both the upper and lower secondary levels）．
2．See Box IV．3．1 for the definition of socio－economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools．
Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Tables IV．1．1，IV．1．2，IV．1．3，IV．1．4，IV．1．5，IV．1．19 and IV．1．20．
StatLink 司定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957403

Figure IV.1.24
How school characteristics are related to mathematics performance
Expressed as a percentage of the average variation in mathematics performance in OECD countries ( $100 \%$ is the average total variation in mathematics performance across OECD countries)

Variation in mathematics performance accounted for:
$\square$ Solely by schools' policies and practices, resources and the learning environment
$\square$ Jointly by schools' policies and practices, resources and the learning environment and students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profile
$\square$ Solely by students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profile
$\square$ Unaccounted for by any of the above aspects


Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the between-school variation accounted for by schools' policies and practices, resources and the learning environment and students' and schools' socio-economic status and demographic profile, whether solely or jointly.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.1.12a.


## Notes

1. These data are extracted from Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2013c) for the countries that participate in the regular annual OECD data collection that is administered through the INES Network. For other countries and economies, a special system-level data collection was conducted in collaboration with PISA Governing Board members and National Project Managers.
2. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in Tables IV.1.1, IV.1.2, IV.1.3, IV.1.4 and IV.1.5, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also examined in order to confirm the robustness of the results. When outliers drive the results, Pearson's correlation coefficients are stronger than Spearman's correlation coefficients. Thus, the cases where Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level are flagged in the tables. The same procedure is applied to partial correlation coefficients.
3. The percentage is obtained by squaring the partial correlation coefficient and then multiplying it by 100 .
4. Partial correlation coefficients are - 0.36 among all participating countries and economies (significant at the $5 \%$ level).
5. Selection bias in this case refers to how to separate the effect of grade repetition from differences in achievement due to the selection of students who must repeat grades.
6. The partial correlation coefficient is -0.34 .
7. These estimates do not address either the potential benefits of grade repetition or the costs if school systems do not allow for grade repetition. For example, students who had repeated a grade might be better prepared for the labour market than if they had not done so. And schools might have to spend more to offer remedial classes to struggling students if those students are not permitted to repeat a year.
8. Throughout this section, and the entire volume, trends in the OECD average refer to the group of OECD countries that have comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. In general, this excludes Chile, Estonia, Israel and Slovenia, which did not take part in PISA 2003. For school-level resources, policies and practices, this also excludes France, which did not distribute the school questionnaire to school principals in PISA 2003.
9. Trends analyses on student performance are available only for the 39 countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, distributed the PISA 2003 questionnaire, and have comparable samples for the two assessments. PISA 2003 did not include questions on school competition, teacher appraisal, school transfers, skipping school, dropping out of school, attending after-school lessons, parental pressure or parental involvement. It is thus not possible to determine trends for these. Similarly, some questions relating to the same policy or practiced changed between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, making it impossible to track trends related to them. Such is the case for school admission policies, teaching staff qualifications, and school's responsibility for resource allocation and curricula. With respect to school admission policies, in 2003, question SC10 asked, for each admission criteria, "How much consideration is given to the following factors when students are admitted to your school?" offering the following response options "Prerequiste", "High priority", "Considered" or "Not considered". In 2012, question SC32 asked, "How often are the following factors considered when students are admitted to your school?" and offered "Never", "Sometimes" and "Always" as response options.
With respect to teaching staff qualifications, although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 questionnaires asked school principals about the total number of teachers in the school and the number of those who hold an ISCED 5A (university-equivalent) degree and those who have a teaching certificate, the questions are not comparable. PISA 2012 asked school principals, in broad terms, about the number of teachers in the school who hold an ISCED 5A degree; PISA 2003 asked about the number of teachers in the school who hold an ISCED 5A degree in pedagogy.

Finally, with respect to schools' responsibility for resource allocation and curricula, in the PISA 2003 questionnaire, school principals were asked, "In your school, who has the main responsibility for <each governance attribute>" and were offered the following response options: "Not a main responsibility of the school", "School's governing board", "Principal", "Department Head" or "Teachers". In the PISA 2012 questionnaire, school principals were asked, "Regarding your school, who has a considerable responsibility for <each governance attribute>" and were offered the following response options: "Principal", "Teachers", "School governing board", "Regional or local education authority", "National education authority". In both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, school principals could select as many response options as appropriate.
10. Caution is required when interpreting how the relationship between students' mathematics performance and educational resources, policies and practices has evolved over time. Two reasons explain why this change can occur. First, the resource, policy or practice could have become more strongly related to mathematics performance because it promotes mathematics performance more in 2012 than it did in 2003. Second, higher-performing students and schools may have been more likely to implement this particular resource, policy or practice in 2012 than they were in 2003

The use of student-assessment data for judging teacher effectiveness provides an example:
In PISA 2003, and on average across OECD countries that have comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, students in schools where observations by external personnel were used to monitor teacher practice outperformed students in schools where observations by external personnel were not used to monitor teacher practice. In PISA 2012, however, students in schools that use such observations
to monitor teacher practice underperformed compared with students in schools that did not use observations by external personnel for this purpose. This relationship holds, on average, across OECD countries, but is observed in only six OECD countries. One possible explanation for this reversal is that, on average across OECD countries, monitoring teachers by external personnel became less effective as a tool to promote learning. This explanation implies that the underlying process of using external observations to monitor teacher practice became less effective during the period. If, indeed, there was such a change, the specifics of this change remain unknown. PISA data cannot distinguish whether the reduced effectiveness of external monitoring - assuming that this explains the observed change results from a change in the way the external monitors conducted their observations, the way school principals and teachers reacted to these observations, or the way students reacted to the teachers' and principals' reactions to the external observations. In addition, it is not possible to conclude from PISA trends analyses whether this hypothetical reduction in the effectiveness of external observations also applies to schools and school systems that had not yet chosen to use this type of observation, since instruction and learning may benefit from external observations of teacher practices.

Another explanation for this trend posits that the efficacy of external observations remained unchanged over the period, but that the types of schools that chose to use them have changed. Under this argument, better-performing schools tended to use external monitoring in 2003, but were less likely to do so by 2012. It could be the case that schools that used external observations in 2012 were those that were aware of their lower performance levels compared to schools in 2003. This alternative explanation suggests that schools used external observations because they showed poorer performance, as opposed to performing poorly because they used external observations. That causation between students' performance and the use of external observations could go either way underscores the importance of applying caution in interpreting these results.
11. It is difficult to explain these trends without further analyses of how students are selected into schools and the heterogeneity of these student populations. PISA was unable to undertake these analyses because variables on schools' admission criteria are not comparable between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 (see note 3).
12. Comparisons of expenditure data from 2003 and 2012 are limited to a subset of 24 countries. Analyses for 2012 consider 48 countries and economies with information on cumulative expenditure on education for students aged 6 to 15 . Of the countries and economies analysed in 2012, 16 did not participate in PISA 2003 and 7 do not have information on cumulative expenditure in 2003. Seven of the countries and economies not included in the trends analysis had cumulative expenditure per student above USD 50000 and 17 had cumulative expenditures under USD 50000 in 2012.
13. Across OECD countries, the correlation is 0.32 .
14. The correlation is -0.22 across 17 countries and economies whose per capita GDP is less than USD 20000.
15. Statistically significant coefficients in Table IV.1.2 are mainly the result of outliers. For example, the correlation between the studentteacher ratio and performance is -0.48 across OECD countries, but it is 0.09 after excluding two countries with extreme student-teacher ratios ( 31 in Mexico and 22 in Chile, while the average ranges from 8 to 18 in other OECD countries).
16. $46 \%=17 \% /(8 \%+3 \%+17 \%+9 \%)$.
17. Across OECD countries, the correlation between mathematics performance and average learning time in regular mathematics lessons is -0.30 (significant at the $10 \%$ level), but this is mainly because of outliers.
18. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of this volume and other volumes of this series highlight other country's improvements in PISA and outline their recent policy trajectories (e.g. Poland in Chapter 2, Tunisia in Chapter 3 and Colombia in Chapter 4 of this volume, Brazil, Turkey, Korea and Estonia in Volume I, Mexico and Germany in Volume II, and Japan and Portugal in Volume III).
19. Across OECD countries, the correlation between the degree of competition and equity is 0.33 (significant at the $10 \%$ level), while it is 0.23 after excluding Norway, where there is less school competition than in other countries (i.e. the degree of school competition is $35 \%$ in Norway, while it varies from $42 \%$ to $94 \%$ in other OECD countries).
20. Across all participating countries and economies with available data, the correlation between the percentage of students in private schools and the difference in mathematics performance between public and private schools is 0.14 .
21. After accounting for per capita GDP, the correlation is 0.34 across OECD countries and 0.20 across all participating countries and economies.
22. Across OECD countries, the correlation is -0.33 after accounting for per capita GDP and it is -0.31 across all participating countries and economies.
23. The set of countries used to calculate trends in OECD averages includes only those OECD countries that have comparable data in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 for the variable being examined.
24. Significant at the $10 \%$ level $(p<0.10)$.
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## Selecting and Grouping Students

This chapter discusses the ways in which students are selected and grouped into certain education levels, grade levels, schools, programmes and different classes within schools based on their performance. It offers an analysis of whether students in school systems with similar degrees of stratification share similar dispositions for learning mathematics, and examines how stratification practices and policies have changed since 2003.

This chapter focuses on how 15-year-old students are selected and grouped into education levels, grade levels, different schools, programmes, and different groups within schools. The reason for this focus is that, as shown in Chapter 1, in highly stratified systems, education is less equitable.

This chapter first describes various ways of grouping and selecting students, hereafter referred to as vertical and horizontal stratification (Figure IV.2.1). Then comparisons are made across countries to examine which features related to social and academic inclusion are shared among school systems with similar degrees of stratification. This is followed by a section analysing whether students in school systems with similar degrees of stratification share similar dispositions for learning mathematics. The chapter concludes with a look at how systems' selection and grouping of students have changed since PISA 2003.

- Figure IV.2.1 -

Selecting and grouping students as covered in PISA 2012


## What the data tell us

- Across OECD countries, an average of $12 \%$ of students reported that they had repeated a grade at least once. In Japan, Malaysia and Norway, no 15 -year-old student had repeated a grade, while in Colombia and MacaoChina over $40 \%$ of students had repeated a grade at least once. Among the 13 countries and economies with grade repetition rates of more than $20 \%$ in 2003, these rates dropped by an average of 3.5 percentage points by 2012, and fell sharply in France, Luxembourg, Macao-China, Mexico and Tunisia.
- When comparing two students with similar mathematics performance, the student who is more socioeconomically disadvantaged than the other is more likely to have repeated a grade.
- Students in comprehensive school systems - those that do not separate students into different schools according to their performance, such as the systems in Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States - tend to regard learning mathematics as important for their later life, regardless of the system's overall performance.


## HOW STUDENTS PROGRESS THROUGH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

One-room schools, where all students, regardless of age, shared the same classroom and were taught by the same teacher, were commonplace in many countries in the early 19 th century. As student populations grew in size and diversity, schooling was increasingly differentiated "vertically": younger students would concentrate on basic studies, and as they progressed, they would enter more complex and differentiated study programmes. This vertical stratification resulted in the creation of different grades and education levels (Sorensen, 1970; Tyack, 1974). This section describes two of the main factors that have an impact on 15-year-old students' grade level: the age of entry into the school system and grade repetition. It then examines how school systems differ in the way 15 -year-old students are distributed across grade and education levels.

## Students' ages at entry into the school system

Most school systems establish an age of entry into formal schooling. However practical this may be, children do not necessarily develop cognitively or emotionally at the same rate, and certain parents may believe that their children could benefit from starting schooling earlier, or waiting an extra year before they start schooling, a practice known as academic redshirting (Graue and DiPerna, 2000).

In PISA 2012, students were asked at what age they entered primary school, in order to assess the degree of heterogeneity in the student population that schools and teachers have to manage. In general, most students will be within one year of each other when they enter school in education systems that enforce a specific starting age. In countries where parents have more freedom to choose the age at which their children enter school, children may be two or more years above or below the modal age of entry. Thus, the proportion of students who entered school outside this modal two-year window indicates, approximately, the diversity of students' ages at entry into the school system.

Across OECD countries, an average of $51 \%$ of students reported that they started primary school at the age of six and $27 \%$ reported that they started at the age of seven. Some $20 \%$ of students started primary school at the age of five or earlier, while $2 \%$ started at the age of eight or older. ${ }^{1}$ In 41 participating countries and economies, $90 \%$ or more of students started primary school within the national modal two-year window. In Japan and Poland, all students reported that they had started primary school within that window. By contrast, students in Brazil, Qatar, Canada, the United Arab Emirates, Peru and Colombia started primary school when they were younger or older. In Brazil, $67 \%$ of students started primary school at the age of six or seven, while $20 \%$ started at the age of eight or older and $13 \%$ started at the age of five or younger. At least one in two students in Ireland reported that they had started primary school at the age of four, but school is compulsory only at age six (Figure IV.2.2 and Table IV.2.1).

## Grade repetition

Grade repetition is also a form of vertical stratification as it seeks to adapt curricula to student performance, thus creating more homogeneous classes. However, Chapter 1 explains that grade repetition is negatively related to equity in education: systems where more students repeat a grade tend to show a stronger impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance.

PISA asked 15-year-old students whether they had repeated a grade in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school. Across OECD countries, an average of $12 \%$ of students reported that they had repeated a grade at least once: $7 \%$ of students had repeated a grade in primary school, $6 \%$ of students had repeated a lower secondary grade, and $2 \%$ of students had repeated an upper secondary grade. In Japan, Malaysia and Norway, no 15-year-old student reported to have repeated a grade, while in 24 countries and economies, over $0 \%$ but $5 \%$ of students or fewer reported that they had repeated a grade. In contrast, between $20 \%$ and $29 \%$ of students in France, the Netherlands, Peru, Chile and Germany had repeated a grade at least once; between $30 \%$ and $39 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Uruguay, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Luxembourg, Portugal, Costa Rica and Spain had repeated a grade at least once; and in Macao-China and Colombia over $40 \%$ of students had repeated a grade at least once (Figure IV.2.2 and Table IV.2.2).

Among these systems with high rates of grade repetition, over $20 \%$ of students in Portugal, Macao-China, Colombia, Uruguay, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Brazil and Belgium had repeated a grade at least once in primary school. Over $20 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Macao-China, Colombia, Spain, Uruguay, Argentina and Costa Rica had repeated a lower secondary grade at least once; and over $10 \%$ of students in Turkey, Chile and Italy had repeated an upper secondary grade at least once (Table IV.2.2). Caution is required in comparing these results across systems, since the number of years in primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education differs according to the structure of the school systems.
－Figure IV．2．2
How students are grouped in a school system（vertical stratification）


Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Tables IV．2．1，IV．2．2 and IV．2．4
StatLink 冓定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957308

PISA 2012 shows that in 35 out of 61 countries and economies examined, disadvantaged students are more likely to have repeated a grade than advantaged students, even after accounting for student performance in mathematics (Table IV.2.3). This means that when comparing two students with similar mathematics performance, the student who is more socio-economically disadvantaged than the other is more likely to have repeated a grade. As shown in Figure IV.2.3, on average across OECD countries, if a student scoring 300 points in mathematics is socio-economically advantaged, the likelihood that he or she had repeated a grade is 35 out of 100, while the likelihood of repeating a grade is 45 out of 100 if this student is socio-economically disadvantaged. In general, the higher a student's score, the less likely it is that the student had repeated a grade. But disadvantaged students are still at higher risk of repeating a grade than their advantaged counterparts. For example, if a student who scores 400 points is advantaged, the likelihood that he or she had repeated a grade is 14 out of 100 , while the likelihood is 19 out of 100 if this student is disadvantaged.

This finding is consistent with the results of other studies showing that the incidence of grade repetition is highest among students from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds (Gomes-Neto and Hanushek, 1994). A study based on PISA 2009 data found that, in about half of the countries examined, students' socio-economic status is related to the likelihood of repeating a grade, even after accounting for student academic performance (Monseur and Lafontaine, 2012). In fact, data from PISA 2009 revealed that, among OECD countries, $53 \%$ of the variation in the likelihood of a student repeating a primary grade is observed at the student level, $28 \%$ at the school level, and $19 \%$ at the system level (Goos et al., 2013).

- Figure IV.2.3 ■

Probability of students having repeated a grade, by students' socio-economic status
(OECD average)


Notes: ESCS is the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Students having repeated a grade refers to students who have repeated a grade in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.2.3.
StatLink 立insh http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957308

## Students' grade and education levels

As a consequence of the variations in the age of starting primary school and/or in grade repetition, students in the same age group can be found in different grade and education levels. This is particularly important for PISA as participation is based on students' age.

As shown in Figure IV.2.2, 15-year-old students tend to be enrolled at similar grade levels in Iceland, Japan, Norway, Serbia, Malaysia, the United Kingdom, Korea and Sweden, while there are relatively greater variations in the grade levels
in which 15 -year-olds in Colombia, Peru, Uruguay and Tunisia are enrolled. The modal grade for 15 -year-old students depends on the school system: in PISA-participating countries it is usually grade 9, 10 or 11 . Depending on the timing of the start of the academic year and the PISA data collection, in some systems, about an half of all 15-year-old students are in one grade and another half are in another grade either just above or just below. Across OECD countries, $74 \%$ of students are at the modal grade, $9 \%$ are in grades above the modal grade, and $17 \%$ are in grades below the modal grade. All 15 -year-old students in Japan and Iceland, and over $95 \%$ of them in Norway, Serbia, Malaysia and the United Kingdom, are at the modal grade, while fewer than one in two students is in the modal grade in Costa Rica, Colombia, Brazil, Macao-China, Peru, Indonesia and the Netherlands (Table IV.2.4).

As 15-year-olds are enrolled in various grades, some of them are in lower secondary education while others are in upper secondary education. Across OECD countries, $46 \%$ of 15 -year-old students are in lower secondary education and $54 \%$ are in upper secondary education. Over $99 \%$ of 15 -year-old students in Iceland, Jordan, Romania, Lithuania, Spain, Finland, Norway, Denmark and Poland are in lower secondary education, while over $99 \%$ of 15 -year-old students in Croatia, Japan, the United Kingdom and Montenegro are in upper secondary education (Figure IV.2.2 and Table IV.2.4).

## HOW EDUCATION SYSTEMS ORGANISE SCHOOL PROGRAMMES

Students with different socio-economic status, different levels of achievement and different interests are found in every grade. School systems address this diversity in different ways. Some seek to adapt curricula so that students with different interests and academic preparation are exposed to a curriculum and pedagogy that is better suited to them. This type of stratification, referred to as "horizontal" stratification in this report, is the product of decisions made at the system level, such as offering the choice of general/academic and vocational programmes or basing entry into the school on academic achievement (Dupriez et al., 2008), or by decisions made at the school level, such as transferring students to other schools. Some schools group students based on their ability across classes. School-level policies are less relevant in systems with other types of grouping/sorting of students at the system level, as these education systems have already differentiated students to a large degree. The rationale behind using these differentiating mechanisms is to homogenise the student population so that its educational needs can be met more effectively. But there is some concern that tracking replicates existing social and economic inequities, as socio-economically disadvantaged students tend to be disproportionately grouped into lower tracks (Oakes, 2005). By contrast, other school systems seek to address the diversity in student populations by individualising education experiences within an established cohort of students over a longer period of time, and delay any type of stratification until the later years of secondary education or in higher education.

## The number of study programmes and age of selection

In comprehensive school systems, all 15-year-old students follow the same programme, while in differentiated school systems, students are streamed into different programmes. Some of these programmes may be primarily academic, others offer primarily vocational components, and yet others may offer combinations of academic and vocational programmes (Kerckhoff, 2000; LeTendre et al., 2003). Differentiated systems must also decide at which age students will be sorted into these different programmes. Chapter 1 presents evidence that in countries and economies that sort students into different education programmes at an early age, the impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance is stronger than in systems that select and group students later. Education reforms in Poland shifted the age of selection to increase the amount of time students spend in comprehensive schools with evidence suggesting it has helped improve student performance in mathematics, reading and science (OECD, 2011a). Box IV.2.1 provides more details on Poland's trajectory in PISA and their recent education reforms.

On average across OECD countries, school systems begin selecting students for different programmes at the age of 14. However, this varies greatly across countries. Among OECD countries, the first age of selection varies from age 10 in Austria and Germany, to age 16 in Australia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. Among partner countries and economies, the first age of selection varies from around age 11 in Uruguay and 12 in Singapore, to age 16 in Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania and Peru (Figure IV.2.4 and Table IV.2.5).

The number of school types or distinct education programmes available to 15-year-old students also varies across countries. Among OECD countries, it varies from one distinct programme in Australia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, to five or more programmes in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands and the Slovak Republic. Among partner countries and economies with available data, it ranges from one programme in Indonesia and Jordan and two programmes in Brazil, Colombia,

Hong Kong-China, Macao-China, Romania and Thailand, to five or more programmes in Montenegro, Uruguay, Croatia, Malaysia, Shanghai-China, the United Arab Emirates, Latvia and Lithuania (Figure IV.2.4 and Table IV.2.5).

In PISA, students were asked to report on the kind of programme in which they were enrolled. Then their responses were categorised according to programme orientation. As shown in Figure IV.2.4, across OECD countries, an average of $82 \%$ of 15 -year-old students are enrolled in a programme with a general curriculum, $14 \%$ are enrolled in a programme with a pre-vocational or vocational curriculum, and $4 \%$ are in modular programmes that combine any or all of these characteristics. In Brazil, Denmark, Finland, Hong Kong-China, Iceland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Singapore, Tunisia and the United States, all 15 -year-old students are in a general programme. In Serbia, Croatia, Austria, Montenegro and Slovenia, more than one in two students are enrolled in a vocational or prevocational programme. In Canada, all 15-year-olds, and in the Slovak Republic one out of four students, are enrolled in a modular programme (Table IV.2.6).

Admission and placement policies establish frameworks for selecting students for academic programmes and for streaming students according to career goals, educational needs and academic performance. In countries with large differences in student performance between programmes and schools or where socio-economic segregation is firmly entrenched because of residential segregation, admission and grouping policies have high stakes for parents and students. The most effective schools may be those more successful in attracting motivated students and in retaining good teachers; conversely, a "brain drain" of students and staff can undermine schools. Once admitted to school, students become members of a community of peers and adults and, as shown in Volume II, the socio-economic context of the school in which students are enrolled tends to be much more strongly related to student performance than students' individual socio-economic status.

In some school systems, the school catchment area determines admission into school. The school catchment area is used as a criterion because of: administrative responsibilities to ensure adequate capacity for students in those areas and plan for future needs; formal institutional areas, such as official communities or neighbourhoods that require separate education administration for legal, historical, or economic purposes; and deliberate isolation of populations due to racial, ethnic or socio-economic differences with other populations. According to principals' reports, on average across OECD countries, $41 \%$ of students are in schools where residence in a particular area is always considered as part of the criteria for admission. In Poland, the United States, Greece, Canada and Finland, more than two in three students are enrolled in such schools. By contrast, fewer than $10 \%$ of students in Belgium, Serbia, Slovenia, Macao-China, Peru, Croatia, Montenegro, Singapore, Mexico, Japan and Romania are enrolled in schools that always consider residence in a particular area for admission (Table IV.2.7). Among these countries and economies, over $94 \%$ of 15 -year-old students are at upper secondary education in Croatia, Japan, Montenegro, Serbia, Singapore Slovenia and Greece, while 100\% of 15 -year-old students are at lower secondary education in Romania (Table IV.2.4).

Some school systems are highly selective and base admission on students' academic performance. Across OECD countries, $43 \%$ of students are in academically selective schools whose principals reported that at least "students' records of academic performance" or "recommendations of feeder schools" is always considered for admission. In the Netherlands, Croatia, Hong Kong-China, Japan, Thailand, Serbia, Viet Nam, Hungary, Singapore and Bulgaria, over $80 \%$ of students are in academically selective schools, while in Finland, Spain, Norway, Greece, Sweden, Denmark, Argentina, Poland and Lithuania, fewer than 20\% of students are enrolled in such schools (Figure IV.2.4 and Table IV.2.7).

As expected, systems in which schools tend to select their students based on residence in a particular area are generally less academically selective. However, in Switzerland and Liechtenstein, schools are selective according to both catchment area and students' academic performance and/or recommendations of feeder schools (Figure IV.2.5).

The criteria used for admitting students to schools differ between lower and upper secondary education in some school systems where lower and upper secondary education are not provided in the same school. Across OECD countries, an average of $49 \%$ of 15 -year-old students in lower secondary education attend schools that use residence in a particular area as one of the criteria for admitting students, while $32 \%$ of 15 -year-old students at the upper secondary level attend such schools. In contrast, academic selectivity is more prevalent at the upper secondary than the lower secondary level. Across OECD countries on average, $32 \%$ of lower secondary students attend schools whose principals reported that at least either "students' records of academic performance" or "recommendations of feeder schools" is always considered for admission, while $56 \%$ of upper secondary students attend such schools. The difference in academic selectivity between 15-year-old students at the lower and upper secondary levels is notable in Hungary, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Sweden, Bulgaria, Shanghai-China, Korea and Austria, where the difference is over 40 percentage points (Table IV.2.8).

Figure IV.2.4 [Part 1/2] -
How students are grouped across and within schools (horizontal stratification)

|  | Number of education programmes available for students at age 15 | Early selection (first age of selection in the education system) | Percentage of students who are enrolled in a programme whose curriculum is:```\square \text { General} \square \text { Pre-vocational or vocational} \square \text { Modular}``` | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that "students' records of academic performance" or "recommendations of feeder schools" are considered for admission |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | At least one of these two factors is "always" considered |
| Q Australia | 1 | 16 | - | 44 |
| Austria | 4 | 10 | , | 71 |
| - Belgium | 4 | 12 | - | 27 |
| Canada | 1 | 16 |  | 39 |
| Chile | 1 | 16 |  | 39 |
| Czech Republic | 6 | 11 | 1 | 58 |
| Denmark | 1 | 16 |  | 15 |
| Estonia | 1 | 15 |  | 38 |
| Finland | 1 | 16 |  | 4 |
| France | 3 | 15 |  | 31 |
| Germany | 4 | 10 |  | 62 |
| Greece | 2 | 15 | -- | 8 |
| Hungary | 3 | 11 |  | 85 |
| Iceland | 1 | 16 |  | 21 |
| Ireland | 4 | 15 |  | 27 |
| Israel | 2 | 15 |  | 56 |
| Italy | 4 | 14 |  | 66 |
| Japan | 2 | 15 |  | 94 |
| Korea | 3 | 14 |  | 67 |
| Luxembourg | 4 | 13 | ---------------------1 | 72 |
| Mexico | 3 | 15 |  | 51 |
| Netherlands | 7 | 12 |  | 97 |
| New Zealand | 1 | 16 |  | 59 |
| Norway | 1 | 16 |  | 7 |
| Poland | 1 | 16 |  | 19 |
| Portugal | 3 | 15 |  | 37 |
| Slovak Republic | 5 | 11 |  | 53 |
| Slovenia | 3 | 14 |  | 29 |
| Spain | 1 | 16 |  | 4 |
| Sweden | 1 | 16 |  | 10 |
| Switzerland | 4 | 12 |  | 73 |
| Turkey | 3 | 11 |  | 43 |
| United Kingdom | 1 | 16 |  | 28 |
| United States | 1 | 16 |  | 36 |
| OECD average | 3 | 14 | 1 | 43 |
| Albania | 3 | 15 |  | 60 |
| Argentina | 3 | 15 |  | 15 |
| \% Brazil | 2 | 15 |  | 21 |
| Bulgaria | 3 | 13 | -.j-....--- | 81 |
| Colombia | 2 | 15 |  | 43 |
| Costa Rica | m | m |  | 51 |
| Croatia | 5 | 14 |  | 96 |
| Hong Kong-China | 2 | 15 |  | 94 |
| Indonesia | 1 | 15 |  | 67 |
| Jordan | 1 | 16 |  | 36 |
| Kazakhstan | m | m |  | 46 |
| Latvia | 5 | 16 |  | 29 |
| Liechtenstein | 3 | 15 |  | 79 |
| Lithuania | 5 | 16 |  | 20 |
| Macao-China | 2 | 15 |  | 78 |
| Malaysia | 5 | 15 |  | 55 |
| Montenegro | 6 | 15 |  | 59 |
| Peru | 3 | 16 |  | 30 |
| Qatar | 4 | 15 |  | 50 |
| Romania | 2 | 14 |  | 35 |
| Russian Federation | 3 | 16 |  | 23 |
| Serbia | m | m |  | 87 |
| Shanghai-China | 5 | 15 | + | 53 |
| Singapore | 4 | 12 |  | 82 |
| Chinese Taipei | 3 | 15 |  | 50 |
| Thailand | 2 | 15 |  | 88 |
| Tunisia | m | m |  | 51 |
| United Arab Emirates | 5 | 15 |  | 70 |
| Uruguay | 6 | 11 |  | 27 |
| Viet Nam | 4 | 15 |  | 87 |
|  |  |  |       <br> 0 20 40 60 80 100 |  |

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.2.5, IV.2.6, IV.2.7, IV.2.9 and IV.2.11.
StatLink 可ilisk http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957308

Figure IV.2.4 [Part 2/2] •

## How students are grouped across and within schools (horizontal stratification)

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that "mathematics classes study similar content, but at different levels of difficulty" and/or "different classes study different content or sets of mathematics topics that have different levels of difficulty" |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds would "very likely" be transferred to another school because of "low academic achievement", "behavioural problems" or "special learning needs" | $\square$ No ability grouping for any class <br> $\square$ One form of grouping for some classes <br> $\square$ One form of grouping for all classes |
| 8 Australia | 3 | $\square$ |
| ${ }^{4}$ Austria | 65 |  |
| O Belgium | 28 |  |
| Canada | 5 |  |
| Chile | 23 |  |
| Czech Republic | 10 |  |
| Denmark | 2 |  |
| Estonia | 4 |  |
| Finland | 0 |  |
| France | 17 |  |
| Germany | 6 |  |
| Greece | 25 |  |
| Hungary | 15 |  |
| Iceland | 1 |  |
| Ireland | 2 |  |
| Israel | 20 |  |
| Italy | 17 |  |
| Japan | 6 |  |
| Korea | 26 |  |
| Luxembourg | 19 |  |
| Mexico | 20 |  |
| Netherlands | 10 |  |
| New Zealand | 4 |  |
| Norway | 1 |  |
| Poland | 4 |  |
| Portugal | 4 |  |
| Slovak Republic | 24 |  |
| Slovenia | 22 |  |
| Spain | 3 |  |
| Sweden | 3 |  |
| Switzerland | 10 |  |
| Turkey | 27 |  |
| United Kingdom | 3 | - |
| United States | 4 |  |
| OECD average | 13 |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ Albania | 10 |  |
| \% Argentina | 11 |  |
| ご Brazil | 15 |  |
| Bulgaria | 31 |  |
| Colombia | 15 | --- |
| Costa Rica | 23 |  |
| Croatia | 17 |  |
| Hong Kong-China | 9 |  |
| Indonesia | 35 |  |
| Jordan | 43 |  |
| Kazakhstan | 9 |  |
| Latvia | 11 |  |
| Liechtenstein | 46 |  |
| Lithuania | 3 |  |
| Macao-China | 36 |  |
| Malaysia | 26 | - - |
| Montenegro | 10 |  |
| Peru | 19 |  |
| Qatar | 11 |  |
| Romania | 22 |  |
| Russian Federation | 5 |  |
| Serbia | 20 |  |
| Shanghai-China | 7 |  |
| Singapore | 2 |  |
| Chinese Taipei | 28 |  |
| Thailand | 14 |  |
| Tunisia | 24 |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 16 |  |
| Uruguay | 4 |  |
| Viet Nam | 20 |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{ccccc} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 20 & 40 & 60 & \vdots\end{array}$ |

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.2.5, IV.2.6, IV.2.7, IV.2.9 and IV.2.11.
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Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.2.7.


## School transferring policies

Transferring students out of school because of low academic achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs is one way that schools reduce the heterogeneity in the learning environment and facilitate instruction for the remaining students.

PISA 2012 asked school principals about policies governing student transfers, namely about the likelihood of transferring a student to another school because of low academic achievement, high academic achievement, behavioural problems, special learning needs, parents' or guardians' request, or other reasons. As shown in Figure IV.2.4, on average across OECD countries, $13 \%$ of students attend a school whose principal reported that the school would "very likely" transfer students because of low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs. In Austria, Liechtenstein, Jordan, Macao-China, Indonesia and Bulgaria, over 30\% of students attend such schools, while in Finland, Norway, Iceland, Singapore, Denmark, Ireland and Australia, fewer than 3\% of students attend such schools (Table IV.2.9).

In some systems, policies on transferring students to other schools differ between lower and upper secondary education. In the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Indonesia, Israel, Hungary, Italy and Korea, students in upper secondary education are more likely - by 10 percentage points or more - to be transferred because of low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs than students in lower secondary education (Table IV.2.10).

## Ability grouping within schools

Some school systems group students within the schools they attend. The rationale behind this practice is much the same as for other types of grouping or selecting of students, namely to better meet the students' needs by creating a more homogeneous learning environment and facilitating instruction. Because individual schools are nested within a broader organisation, the uses of ability grouping within schools is partly determined by the homogeneity/heterogeneity that results from other forms of stratification, such as school-admittance policies, grade retention or transfer policies.

Students can be grouped by ability across or within classes. Across OECD countries, $67 \%$ of students attend schools whose principal reported that students in mathematics classes study similar content, but at different levels of difficulty at least in some classes, and $54 \%$ of students attend schools whose principal reported that mathematics classes vary in content and level of difficulty at least in some classes. In sum, three out of four students are in schools whose principals reported that the school uses one of these forms of between-class ability grouping in at least some mathematics classes. Over 95\% of students in Albania, the United Kingdom, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia, Israel, Kazakhstan, Singapore, the Russian Federation and Malaysia attend schools where students are grouped by ability across classes, while fewer than $50 \%$ of students in Greece, Austria, the Czech Republic, Norway and Slovenia attend such schools (Table IV.2.11).

Students are sometimes grouped according to ability within classes. Across OECD countries, 49\% of students attend schools whose principal reported that students are grouped by ability within their mathematics classes at least in some classes, while $79 \%$ of students attend schools whose teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with diverse abilities at least in some classes. In Israel, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Ireland, Australia, Singapore, the Russian Federation and Iceland, over $80 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that students are grouped by ability within their mathematics classes. In these countries, students are also grouped across classes based on ability: $87 \%$ to $99 \%$ of students in these countries are in schools where principals reported having ability grouping across classes, at least in some classes. By contrast, in Greece, Montenegro, Uruguay, Turkey, Tunisia, Poland and Brazil, within-class ability grouping is not so common: in these countries, fewer than $20 \%$ of students are in schools whose principal reported having within-class ability grouping in mathematics classes, while no consistent pattern in between-class ability grouping is observed in these countries. In Uruguay and Montenegro, around $92 \%$ of students are in schools with between-class ability grouping; in Tunisia and Brazil around $82 \%$ of students are in such schools; in Turkey, $76 \%$ are in such schools; in Poland, $58 \%$ of students are; and in Greece, $19 \%$ of students are in such schools (Table IV.2.11).

## Box IV.2.1. Improving in PISA: Poland

Poland has been building on progress made between PISA 2000 and PISA 2009 and continued to improve its mathematics, reading and science performance in 2012. Since 2003, mathematics performance has improved at an annual rate of 2.6 points, moving from a below-OECD-average score of 490 in 2003 to an above-OECD-average score of 518 in 2012. The country has reduced the percentage of low-performing students from $22 \%$ to $14 \%$ and increased that of high performers from $10 \%$ to $17 \%$ in a period of nine years. Improvement in mathematics is observed throughout the performance distribution, as both low-achieving and high-achieving students have improved at a similar rate. This improvement in average performance, coupled with an improvement among both high- and low-achieving students as well as top and low performers is also observed in reading (mean reading performance improved by an average of 2.8 points per year since 2000) and science (mean science performance improved by an average of 4.6 points per year since 2006). Because improvements in mathematics performance have touched all students alike, there has been no change in the relationship between students' socio-economic status and their mathematics performance. However, the overall improvement has meant that disadvantaged students have greater chances of being resilient and beating the odds against them: in 2003, $5.3 \%$ of students were considered resilient; by 2012, 7.7\% of students were.

Education policy in Poland has been marked by two recent waves of reform: the structural reform of 1999 and the curricular and examination reform of 2009. In 1998, the Ministry of Education presented the outline of a reform agenda to raise the level of education by increasing the number of people with secondary and higher-education qualifications, ensure equal education opportunities, and support improvements in the quality of education. The reform was also part of a broader set of changes, including reform of the national administration that reduced the number of administrative regions from 49 to 16 , health care reform and pension-system reform.

The education reform envisaged changes in the structure of the education system; giving more responsibility for education to local authorities; reorganising the school network; modifying administration and supervision methods; changing the curriculum; introducing a new central examination system with independent student assessments; reorganising school finances through local government subsidies; and offering new teacher incentives, such as alternative promotion paths and a revised remuneration system.

The structural changes resulted in a new type of school: the lower secondary "gymnasium", which offered the same general education programme to all students and became a symbol of the reform. The belief was that the lower secondary gymnasia would allow Poland to raise the level of education, particularly in rural areas. The previous structure, comprising eight years of primary school followed by four or five years of secondary school or a three-year basic vocational school, was replaced by a system described as $6+3+3$. This meant that education at primary school was reduced from eight to six years. After completing primary school, a pupil would then continue his or her education in a comprehensive, three-year lower secondary school. Thus, the period of general education, based on a common core curriculum and equal standards for all students, was extended by one year. Only after completing three years of lower secondary education would the student move on to a three- or four-year upper secondary school that provided access to higher education or to a three-year basic vocational school. Coincidentally, students' experience in schools has shifted towards common exposure to content and content difficulty. In 2003, $19 \%$ of 15 -year-old lower-secondary students who took part in PISA attended schools whose principal reported that students were not placed in different groups for mathematics classes (either through groups within a particular class or between different classes in the same school). In 2012, 42\% of 15-year-old lower-secondary students attended schools whose principal reported so, further highlighting the increasing degree to which Polish students are incorporating a comprehensive approach to mathematics instruction, in particular, and teaching, in general.

## A core curriculum and new assessments

In parallel, the concept of a core curriculum was adopted. This gave schools extensive autonomy to create their own curricula within a pre-determined general framework, balancing the three goals of education: imparting knowledge, developing skills and shaping attitudes. The curricular reform was designed not only to change the content of school-based education and to encourage innovative teaching methods, but also to change the teaching philosophy and culture of schools. Instead of passively following the instructions of the education authorities, teachers were expected to develop their own teaching styles, which would be tailored to the needs of their students.

Introducing a curricular reform that encouraged autonomy required implementing a system for collecting information and monitoring the education system at the same time. Under this new system, each stage of education ends with a standardised national assessment (in primary education) and examination (in lower and upper secondary education). These assessments and examinations provide students, parents and teachers with feedback; policy makers at the national, regional and local levels can also use the results of the assessment to monitor the performance of the school system. The results from the lower secondary examination are used, together with students' marks, for admission to upper secondary schools. The final upper secondary exam also serves as an entrance exam for universities. The national assessment at the end of primary school and lower secondary examinations were first administered in 2002. The Matura exam was first administered as an external national examination in 2005. All of these examinations are organised, set and marked by the central examination board and regional examination boards, the new institutions that had been set up as part of the reform.

Introducing the national assessment and examination system not only provided an opportunity to monitor learning outcomes, it also changed incentives for students and teachers. It sent a clear signal to students that their success depended directly on their externally evaluated outcomes, and made it possible to assess teachers and schools on a comparable scale across the whole country. It also provided local governments with information on the outcomes of schools that were now under their organisational and financial responsibility.

After the reform, local governments became an even more important part of the Polish school system. School funds were transferred to local governments using a per-pupil formula. Those funds now constitute a large share of their budgets. The reform also introduced a new system of teacher professional development and teacher appraisal. Initially, many teachers upgraded their levels of education and professional skills to meet those new requirements.

Studies suggest that the 1999 structural reforms helped reduce the differences in performance between schools and helped improve the performance of the lowest-achieving students. For example, the between-school variation in reading performance decreased substantially between 2000 and 2009. Additional analyses suggest that the reform improved outcomes for students who would have ended up in basic vocational schools under the old system, but were given a chance to acquire more general skills in newly created lower secondary schools (OECD, 2011a). Undoubtedly, Polish students in 2012 perform at higher levels in PISA than students did in 2003; they are, however, less likely to feel they belong at school, to hold positive attitudes towards school or to show intrinsic or instrumental motivation to learn mathematics.

## Building on earlier reforms

Poland's reforms have also been flexible, adjusting to the needs of a more diverse student population and increased demand to participate in secondary and tertiary education. In this context, in 2009 the Ministry of National Education expanded the reforms initiated in the late 1990s by modifying the national core curriculum for general education and school vocational-training programmes. The new curriculum shifted the focus from the narrow, subject-related requirements to more general, transversal skills and competencies. The new curriculum would focus on experiments, scientific inquiry, problem solving, reasoning and collaboration. National standardised assessments and examinations were adjusted accordingly. The modified lower secondary examination, implemented for the first time in 2012, is the culmination of a three-year information campaign that communicated this new curricular focus to promote changes in teaching practice. The new regulations provided for further extension of schools' and teachers' autonomy. The new framework curriculum requires schools to develop their own sets of programmes instead of using the programmes (and textbooks) from the list accepted by the Ministry. School heads were given flexibility in managing, within a three-year cycle, the instruction time defined for subjects in the curriculum framework. They only have to ensure that the outcomes defined in the national curriculum are attained.

The Ministry granted more autonomy to schools and teachers, while maintaining a system of accountability via standardised assessments and examinations. The system of quality assurance, evaluation and accountability were modified as well. In 2009, the Ministry of Education defined three complementary functions of school supervision: evaluation, control and support. External evaluation is conducted by inspectors and is based on a school selfevaluation process as well as on evidence gathered from documents and the opinions of teachers, students, parents and other stakeholders (local employers, community and administration). Value-added models are used to a greater extent, and schools can use a web-based platform to compare improvements in student performance with other schools and against regional or national benchmarks. A value-added model approach promotes equal opportunities as the analysis focuses on student and school progress and not on the achievement level, so even schools with the lowest-performing students can demonstrate the quality of their teaching.

PISA offers an opportunity to follow the trajectory of the reform by measuring the performance of the age groups that were affected by the reform in different ways. The first group, those assessed in 2000, was not affected by the reform. The group of 15 -year-olds assessed in 2003 had started primary school in the former system, but attended the new lower secondary gymnasia. Those students all had the same curricula and were not divided into different school types. The students covered by PISA 2006 had been part of the reformed education system for most of their school career, while those assessed in 2009 and 2012 had been part of that system for their entire school career. In addition, students assessed in 2012 also benefitted from the curricular reform of 2009.

## Source:

OECD (2011a), "The Impact of the 1999 Education Reform in Poland", OECD Education Working Papers, No. 49, OECD Publishing.

## SOCIAL AND ACADEMIC INCLUSION AND VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL STRATIFICATION

As discussed above, school systems have developed different ways to manage the diversity of the student population. Analysis of PISA data can show how - and whether - these various forms of vertical and horizontal stratification are negatively associated with equity, as discussed in Chapter 1, and how these are associated each other and with the socio-economic profiles of systems. Caution is advised, however, when interpreting these results. The results do not imply any causality between the indicators, but merely show that there are some commonalities or differences. In addition, variables that are omitted in this analysis might affect the observed relationships.

As expected, systems where 15 -year-old students are distributed across a wider range of grades tend to have higher rates of grade repetition (across OECD countries, the correlation coefficient is 0.71 ). These more vertically differentiated systems also tend to be highly differentiated horizontally, which means that they tend to have more programmes available to 15 -year-old students, ( $r=0.50$ ) and they select and sort students in the students' early years at school ( $r=0.45$ ) (Figure IV.2.6 and Table IV.2.12).

The indicators measuring horizontal stratification between schools are inter-correlated. Systems with more education programmes available to 15 -year-old students tend to select and sort students at the earlier stage of their education ( $r=0.73$ across OECD countries), also tend to have more students in vocational or pre-vocational programmes ( $r=0.54$ ) and have more students in academically selective schools ( $r=0.60$ ). Systems where students are selected and sorted early tend to have more students in vocational or pre-vocational programmes ( $r=0.50$ ) and have more students in academically selective schools ( $r=0.53$ ). These four indicators are also related to another indicator measuring horizontal stratification between schools. Across OECD countries, systems with more education programmes tend to have a greater incidence of school transfers ( $r=0.41$ ). Systems in which more students are enrolled in vocational programmes tend to have a greater incidence of school transfers $(r=0.75)$ as do systems in which students are selected and sorted early tend $(r=0.53)$ and systems with more academically selective schools ( $r=0.32$ ) (Figure IV.2.6 and Table IV.2.12).

There is no consistent pattern in the relationship between vertical stratification and ability grouping mathematics classes within schools. By contrast, indicators of between-school horizontal stratification are related to ability grouping within schools. For example, systems with more students in vocational or pre-vocational programmes tend to have less ability grouping within schools ( $r=-0.48$ across OECD countries).

- Figure IV.2.6


## System-level correlation between indicators of stratification

## Correlation coefficients between two relevant indicators

Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 (i.e. a perfect negative linear association) to +1.00 (i.e. a perfect positive linear association). When a correlation coefficient is 0 , there is no linear relationship between two indicators.

| $\square$ Across OECD countries$\square$$\square$ Across all participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  | Vertical stratification <br> Variability in students' grade levels | Horizontal stratification |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Between schools | Within schools |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number of educational tracks | Prevalence of vocational and prevocational programmes | Early selection | Academic selectivity | School transfer rates | Ability grouping for all mathematics classes |
|  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance |  | -0.31 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.20 | -0.17 | -0.07 |
|  |  |  | Mathematics performance | Inequity |  | 0.56 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.15 | 0.29 | -0.10 |
| Vertical stratification |  | Variability in students' grade levels | -0.36 | 0.26 |  | 0.50 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.04 |
| Horizontal stratification | Between schools | Number of educational tracks | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.26 |  | 0.54 | 0.73 | 0.60 | 0.41 | -0.13 |
|  |  | Prevalence of vocational and pre-vocational programmes | 0.09 | -0.01 | -0.12 | 0.39 |  | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.75 | -0.48 |
|  |  | Early selection | 0.12 | 0.42 | 0.16 | 0.49 | 0.28 |  | 0.53 | 0.53 | -0.17 |
|  |  | Academic selectivity | 0.15 | -0.09 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.28 |  | 0.32 | 0.08 |
|  |  | School transfer rates | -0.19 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.37 | 0.20 | 0.30 |  | -0.32 |
|  | Within schools | Ability grouping for all mathematics classes | -0.25 | -0.17 | 0.08 | 0.02 | -0.30 | -0.22 | -0.02 | -0.17 |  |

Notes: Correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are indicated in bold and those at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are in italics. Inequity refers to variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students. Correlations with mathematics performance and inequity are partial correlation coefficients after accounting for per capita GDP.
Ability grouping for all mathematics classes is the system-level percentage of students in schools whose principal reports that students are grouped by ability in all classes.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.1.1 and IV.2.12.
StatLink (inist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957308

As Figure IV.2.6 shows, some of these stratification methods are interrelated. In order to determine the extent to which the various methods of stratification are associated with the social and academic profiles of school systems, PISA developed three indices: an index of vertical stratification; an index of between-school horizontal stratification; ${ }^{2}$ and an index of ability grouping within schools. The index of vertical stratification is based on the degree of variation in 15-year-old students' grade levels in the system, which also reflects the different starting ages for schooling and the prevalence of grade repetition. The index of between-school horizontal stratification is based on five interrelated indicators of horizontal stratification between schools. The index of ability grouping within schools is based on the prevalence of within-school ability grouping across the school system (Table IV.2.16). All of these indices are standardised. ${ }^{3}$

Countries and economies in the top right quadrant in Figure IV.2.7 are those that have higher levels of vertical and horizontal (between-school) stratification than the OECD average. Countries and economies in the bottom left quadrant in Figure IV.2.7 are those that have lower levels of vertical and horizontal (between school) stratification than the OECD average.

Figure IV.2.7 ■
Vertical and horizontal stratification


Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.2.16.


Each of the three stratification indices is then compared with various socio-economic and academic profiles of the school systems. The socio-economic profile includes the variation in students' socio-economic status within the system, and the level of social inclusion in the system, which indicates how much of the variation in students' socio-economic status is attributable to differences within schools. The academic profile includes the variation in students' mathematics performance within a system, and the level of academic inclusion in the system, which indicates how much of the variation in students' performance in mathematics is attributable to differences within schools.

As shown in Figure IV.2.8, the degree of stratification is associated with different aspects of the socio-economic and academic profile of the system. Systems with a greater degree of vertical stratification also tend to have students from more diverse socio-economic status ( $r=0.59$ for OECD countries and $r=0.57$ for all countries and economies) and tend to have lower levels of social inclusion ( $r=-0.43$ for OECD countries and $r=-0.43$ for all participating countries and economies) (Table IV.2.13).

Across OECD countries, systems that use more between-school horizontal stratification tend to have lower levels of socio-economic inclusion ( $r=-0.36$ ), greater variation in student mathematics performance ( $r=0.34$ ), and lower levels of academic inclusion ( $r=-0.83$ ). The picture is similar when including partner countries and economies ( $r=-0.71$ ). In contrast, the degree of within-school horizontal stratification in a system does not seem to be consistently associated with the system's socio-economic and academic profile (Figure IV.2.8 and Table IV.2.13).

System-level correlation between indices of stratification and student characteristics

|  |  | Index of vertical stratification | Index of horizontal stratification (between schools) | Index of horizontal stratification (within schools) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD countries | Variation in student socio-economic status (standard deviation of ESCS) | 0.59 | 0.11 | -0.02 |
|  | Socio-economic inclusion index (1-rho) | -0.43 | -0.36 | 0.03 |
|  | Variation in mathematics performance (standard deviation) | -0.03 | 0.34 | 0.06 |
|  | Academic inclusion index (1-rho) | -0.23 | -0.83 | 0.19 |
| All participating countries and economies | Variation in student socio-economic status (standard deviation of ESCS) | 0.57 | 0.06 | -0.05 |
|  | Socio-economic inclusion index (1-rho) | -0.43 | -0.20 | 0.05 |
|  | Variation in mathematics performance (standard deviation) | -0.21 | 0.21 | -0.14 |
|  | Academic inclusion index (1-rho) | -0.24 | -0.71 | 0.10 |

Notes: Correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are indicated in bold and those at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are in italic.
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.2.13.


## HOW SYSTEMS' GROUPING AND SELECTING OF STUDENTS IS RELATED TO STUDENTS' INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION

A student's aspiration can be defined as the "ability to identify and set goals for the future, while being inspired in the present to work toward those goals" (Quaglia and Cobb, 1996). Existing research on the impact of stratification on students' educational aspirations mainly focuses on the goal-setting aspects of aspiration. These studies used students' reports on the level of education they expected to attain at the end of their formal schooling as a measure of educational aspiration. They showed that in highly differentiated systems, the impact of a students' socio-economic status on his or her educational goals is stronger than in less differentiated systems (Buchmann and Dalton, 2002; Buchmann and Park, 2009; Monseur and Lafontaine, 2012). In highly differentiated systems, socio-economically disadvantaged students tend to be grouped into less academically orientated tracks or schools, and this has an impact on their educational aspirations, possibly because of the stigma associated with expectations of lower performance among students enrolled in these tracks and schools, or because less - and often poorer quality - resources are allocated to these schools.

In PISA 2012, students were asked about the extent to which they are motivated to work towards their goals. This is measured by students' instrumental motivation for mathematics. Both an index of instrumental motivation for mathematics and an adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics are used in the analysis. Box IV.2.2 provides a description of these indices.

## Box IV.2.2. PISA index of instrumental motivation

An index of instrumental motivation for mathematics is based on students' responses ("strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" or "strongly disagree") to the following four statements:

- Making an effort in mathematics is worth it because it will help me in the work that I want to do later on.
- Learning mathematics is worthwhile for me because it will improve my career prospects.
- Mathematics is an important subject for me because I need it for what I want to study later on.
- I will learn many things in mathematics that will help me get a job.

This index is scaled so that OECD countries have an average of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 . Higher values on the index indicate greater student motivation. In order to allow for international comparisons, students' responses to these questions are also adjusted based on their responses to an anchoring vignette (see Annex A6).

Students tend to report their self-beliefs, motivation and attitudes within the context of what they expect to achieve. For example, if some schools expect their students to attain minimum performance standards and they are given fairly easy mathematics tasks, students would tend to report that they think they are good at mathematics. But if students want to be admitted into a very competitive university, they would tend to report that they are not good at mathematics unless they have shown excellent performance in very difficult mathematics classes. Without having information on the goals that students set for themselves, and the expectations that schools, teachers, parents and the students themselves have, it is difficult to compare differences in motivation between subgroups of students. Therefore, this section focuses solely on systems' overall level of students' motivation.

As shown in Figure IV.2.9, a negative relationship is observed between the levels of students' motivation and the degree to which systems sort and group students into different schools and/or programmes. In the systems that separate students into different schools or programmes more, students tend to report less instrumental motivation for mathematics than students in systems with less horizontal stratification between schools (Table IV.2.14). This relationship is observed for both non-adjusted and adjusted indices, across both OECD and partner countries and economies. This relationship is observed even after accounting for systems' overall performance levels (Table IV.2.15). In the highly stratified systems, the variation in students' motivation is not necessarily greater (see correlations for the standard deviation for the index in Table IV.2.14). Both unmotivated and motivated students reported less motivation than those in less stratified systems (see correlations for the 10th and 90th percentiles of the index in Table IV.2.14).

- Figure IV.2.9 -

Students' motivation and horizontal stratification


[^5]StatLink 霝页 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957308

When individual aspects of horizontal stratification between schools are examined:

- 15-year-old students in systems that offer a larger number of distinct education programmes tend to report less instrumental motivation than students in systems with fewer programmes or tracks (Table IV.2.14).
- Students in systems with larger proportions of students in vocational or pre-vocational programmes tend to report less instrumental motivation than students in systems with smaller proportions of students in non-academic programmes.
- Students in systems that group or select students early tend to report less instrumental motivation than students in systems that select students at a later age.
- Students in systems where a large proportion of students attends academically selective schools tend to report less instrumental motivation than students in systems where a smaller proportion of students attends selective schools.
- Students in systems where a large proportion of students attends schools that transfer problematic students to another school tend to report less instrumental motivation than students in systems that use school transfers less.


## TRENDS IN STRATIFICATION SINCE PISA 2003

Since 39 of the 65 countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 had also taken part in PISA 2003, it is possible to see how stratification practices evolved during the period. Overall, countries and economies that have high rates of grade repetition (i.e. where more than $20 \%$ of students have repeated a grade) have tended to reduce the rate of grade repetition. Trends in horizontal stratification show that, among OECD countries, a similar share of students attends schools where students are grouped by ability in at least some classes. ${ }^{4}$

The PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 questionnaires share many common questions, allowing for trends to be identified. However, some forms of stratification were not included in the PISA 2003 questionnaire, including transferring policies and students' programme orientation, so it is impossible to identify trends in these areas. Although questions relating to the use of academic criteria in selecting students into schools were asked in both questionnaires, the question and response options changed, rendering comparisons unreliable.

## Grade repetition

Grade repetition is a policy through which school systems try to meet students' educational needs. By repeating a grade, slower students are given a second chance to master their coursework. Grade repetition also serves a motivational purpose because it is sometimes also used as a way to penalise students who do not perform well or do not put forth the necessary effort in school. With the prospect of repeating a grade - and thus not moving forward with their peers students at risk may decide to put more effort into their studies to avoid retention. In practice, however, grade repetition has not been shown to benefit student learning (Allen et al., 2010; Alexander et al., 2003). Moreover, grade repetition may have adverse system-level effects as retained students are more likely to drop out, stay longer in the school system, or spend less time in the labour force (Rumberger, 2011; OECD, 2011b). As a result, some countries that had used grade repetition extensively have rejected that policy in favour of early support for struggling students.

The percentage of students who had repeated a grade in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school fell significantly (by 0.5 percentage points) between 2003 and 2012 among the OECD countries that have comparable data. Yet not all school systems rely on grade repetition as a mode of stratification (Dupriez et al., 2008). Among the 13 countries and economies that had grade repetition rates of more than $20 \%$ in 2003, these rates dropped by an average of 3.5 percentage points during the period, and fell sharply in Tunisia, Mexico, France, Macao-China and Luxembourg. In 2012 in Tunisia, Mexico and France, the percentage of 15 -year-olds who reported that they had repeated a grade in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school was at least ten percentage points lower than it was in 2003. Grade repetition rates increased in Belgium and Spain during the same period. Among countries with lower overall repetition rates (those with repetition rates below 20\% in 2003), an important increase in the grade repetition rate was observed in the Slovak Republic (moving from a grade repetition rate of $2.5 \%$ in 2003 to $7.6 \%$ in 2012) while an important reduction in the repetition rate was observed in Ireland (moving from a grade repetition rate of $14 \%$ in 2003 to $9 \%$ in 2012) (Figure IV.2.10 and Table IV.2.18).

Schools in the Russian Federation, Hungary, Australia, Greece and Mexico seem to have moved away from grade repetition. In these five countries and economies, the percentage of students attending schools that have no grade repetition increased by at least ten percentage points between 2003 and 2012. This increase could also signal that schools in these countries and economies have begun to differentiate themselves into those with high and low rates of grade repetition. However, this does not seem to be the case, as the percentage of students who attend schools with a large proportion of students who had repeated a grade has also shrunk (Table IV.2.19).

Change between 2003 and 2012 in grade repetition rates


Notes：Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
The percentage－point difference in the share of students who repeated a grade in 2012 and 2003 （2012－2003）is shown above the country／economy name．Only statistically significant differences are shown．
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable grade repetition measures since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the percentage of students who reported having repeated a grade in primary，lower or upper secondary school in 2012.
Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Table IV．2．18．
StatLink 亦两经 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957308

## Ability grouping within schools

One form of horizontal stratification is ability grouping within the school．In organising mathematics instruction，for example，schools can differentiate their students according to their performance to create more homogeneous learning environments；other schools may opt to gather all students－irrespective of their academic performance－in the same classes to ensure that all students are granted the same opportunities to learn and thus have the same opportunities to succeed．Between 2003 and 2012，the share of students in schools where ability grouping is or is not practiced did not change，on average across countries with comparable data（Figure IV．2．11 and Table IV．2．21）．

Although on average across OECD countries the share of students attending schools where no ability grouping is used for any class remained relatively stable，eight countries and economies saw an increase of more than ten percentage points in the share of students attending schools where ability grouping is used．In Tunisia and Germany，for example， the share of 15 －year－old students attending schools that do not group by ability decreased by more than 20 percentage points；in Denmark，Japan，Hungary，Korea and Uruguay this share was reduced by more than 15 percentage points． Among these countries，different school systems shifted towards different forms of ability grouping．In Germany，for example，more students attended schools that group by ability in some classes or that group by ability in all classes in 2012 than in 2003．This could be the result of broader changes in Germany＇s school system．As described in Box II．3．2， the practice of between－school ability grouping that characterised German school system in the past has been replaced with a more comprehensive approach to schooling in which students with a greater diversity academic abilities are admitted to the same school．In order to adapt to these changes，some schools may choose to group students by ability in some or all classes．By contrast，in Denmark ability grouping in some classes has become more common，while the shares of students attending schools where ability grouping is not used in any class or is used in all classes has decreased． In Korea，ability grouping in all classes has become more common than both ability grouping in some classes and in no classes（Figure IV．2．11 and Table IV．2．21）．

- Figure IV.2.11

Change between 2003 and 2012 in ability grouping
Percentage of students attending schools with no ability grouping for any mathematics class


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The percentage-point difference in the share of students in schools with no ability grouping in 2012 and 2003 (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable ability grouping measures since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students who were in schools where no ability grouping in mathematics was used in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.2.21.
StatLink 司|lst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957308

In seven countries and economies, a comprehensive approach to mathematics instruction within schools has become more common. In Poland, for example, ability grouping in some or all classes also became less common: the share of students in schools where no ability grouping is used for any class increased by 24 percentage points between 2003 and 2012. In Mexico there was a 29 percentage-point drop in the share of students in schools where ability grouping is practiced in some classes. These schools seem to have shifted either towards a comprehensive approach to mathematics ( 8 percentage-point increase) or to ability grouping in all classes ( 20 percentage-point increase) (Figure IV.2.11 and Table IV.2.21).

## Notes

1. In some East Asian countries and economies (including Shanghai-China and Chinese Taipei where over $10 \%$ of students reported that they had started primary school at the age of eight or older), it is common to count age by starting at one when a child is born and adding an additional year for each subsequent lunar year.
2. This includes grouping students into different programmes.
3. Each of three variables contained in the index of vertical stratification is first standardised to have the OECD average as zero and the standard deviation across OECD countries as one. Then, these standardised variables are averaged to obtain the indicator. Similarly, each of five variables contained in the index of between-school horizontal stratification is standardised and then averaged. The index of ability grouping within schools is based on only one variable (i.e. the prevalence of within-school ability grouping across the school system), which is standardised to have the OECD average as zero and the standard deviation across OECD countries as one.
4. The PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 questionnaires share many common questions, allowing for trends to be identified. However, some forms of stratification were not included in the PISA 2003 questionnaire, including transferring policies and students' programme orientation, so it is impossible to identify trends in these areas. Although questions relating to the use of academic criteria in selecting students in schools were asked in both questionnaires, the question and response options changed, rendering comparisons unreliable. In 2003, question SC10 asked, for each admission criteria, "How much consideration is given to the following factors when students are admitted to your school?" offering the following response options "Prerequiste", "High Priority", "Considered" or "Not Considered". In 2012, question SC32 asked, "How often are the following factors considered when students are admitted to your school?" and offered "Never", "Sometimes" and "Always" as response options.
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## Resources Invested in Education

This chapter examines the allocation of human, material and financial resources throughout school systems and the amount of time dedicated to instruction and learning. Resource allocation is also discussed as it relates to school location, the socio-economic profile of schools, programme orientation, education level, and whether a school is public or private. The chapter also analyses changes since 2003 in the level of resources devoted to education and how those resources are allocated.

This chapter examines the allocation of resources to school systems. Human, material and financial resources are examined in this chapter as well as the amount of time dedicated to instruction and learning as shown in Figure IV.3.1.

Although research on school effects has generally shown a modest relationship between educational resources and student learning (Fuller, 1987; Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, 1996; Buchmann and Hannum, 2001; Rivkin, Hanushek and Kain, 2005; Murillo and Román, 2011; Hægeland, Raaum and Salvanes, 2012; Nicoletti and Rabe, 2012), a basic set of resources is crucial for providing students with the opportunity to learn. This chapter focuses not only on the average level of resources available in each school system, but also on how school resources are allocated across schools within systems. Given that some research shows that allocating additional financial resources to disadvantaged schools reduces the achievement gap between disadvantaged and other schools (Lamb, Teese and Helme, 2005; Henry, Fortner and Thompson, 2010), resource allocation has implications for equity in a school system and, as such, is an important consideration for policy makers.

- Figure IV.3.1

Resources invested in education as covered in PISA 2012


## What the data tell us

- In Luxembourg, Jordan, Thailand, Turkey and Shanghai-China, more than three in ten students are in schools whose principals reported that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hinders to some extent or a lot the schools' capacity to provide instruction (the OECD average is fewer than two in ten students attend such schools).
- On average across OECD countries, students who are in socio-economically disadvantaged schools tend to be in classes with four students fewer than students in advantaged schools; but disadvantaged schools tend to be more likely to suffer from teacher shortages, and shortages or inadequacy of educational materials and physical infrastructures than advantaged schools.
- Trends between 2003 and 2012 reveal a reduction in the student-teacher ratio, an increase in classroom instruction time dedicated to mathematics, and a reduction in the time students spend doing mathematics homework. These changes are seen across different types of schools and among both advantaged and disadvantaged students.
- Fifteen-year-old students in 2012 were more likely than 15-year-olds in 2003 to have attended at least one year of pre-primary education, but many of the students who did not attend were disadvantaged - the students who could benefit from pre-primary education the most.

In this chapter, resource allocation across schools is examined by comparing human, material and time resources allocated to schools according to various school features, such as school location, the socio-economic profile of schools, programme orientation, education level, and school type (see also Box IV.3.1). The chapter also analyses how the overall resource level and resource allocation across schools have changed since PISA 2003.

Chapter 1 shows that most of the relationship between school resources and performance is also related to schools' socioeconomic intake. In other words, the quality and quantity of school resources can play an important role in mediating the impact of students' socio-economic status on performance.

## FINANCIAL RESOURCES

## Expenditure on education

Chapter 1 shows that improvements in performance require policies and practices that address more than spending on education, particularly among high-income countries and economies. High-performing systems tend to prioritise higher salaries for teachers.

Policy makers must constantly balance expenditure on education with expenditure for many other public services. Yet despite the competing demands for resources, expenditure on education has increased over the past few years. Between 2001 and 2010, expenditure per primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary student ${ }^{1}$ has increased $40 \%$, on average across OECD countries with data available for both 2001 and 2010 (Table IV.3.1).

Financial resources can be allocated to salaries paid to teachers, administrators and support staff; maintenance or construction costs of buildings and infrastructure; and operational costs, such as transportation and meals for students.

Total expenditure by educational institutions per student from the age of 6 to $15^{2}$ exceeds USD 100000 (PPP-corrected dollars) in Luxembourg, Switzerland, Norway, Austria, the Unites States and Denmark. In Luxembourg, cumulative expenditure per students exceeds USD 190 000. In contrast, in Turkey, Mexico and the partner countries Viet Nam, Jordan, Peru, Thailand, Malaysia, Uruguay, Colombia, Tunisia and Montenegro, cumulative expenditure per student over this age period is less than USD 25000 (Table IV.3.1). As expected, spending on education and per capita GDP are highly correlated ( $r=0.95$ across OECD countries and $r=0.94$ across all participating countries and economies in PISA 2012). School systems with greater total expenditure on education tend to be those with higher levels of per capita GDP (Tables IV.3.1 and IV.3.2).

## Teachers' salaries

Teachers' salaries represent the largest single cost in expenditure on education (OECD, 2013). School systems differ not only in how much they pay teachers but in the structure of their pay scales. Lower secondary teachers' salaries ${ }^{3}$ in OECD countries are $124 \%$ of per capita GDP, corrected for differences in purchasing power parities. Relative to their country's national income, lower secondary teachers in Korea, Mexico, Germany, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, Ireland, New Zealand, Canada and the partner countries Jordan, Malaysia, Tunisia, Colombia and Montenegro earn the most. In these countries, annual earnings for lower secondary teachers are between $150 \%$ and $215 \%$ of per capita GDP. By contrast, annual earnings for lower secondary teachers are $70 \%$ or less of per capita GDP in the Slovak Republic, Estonia, Hungary and the partner countries Romania, Indonesia and Latvia. Upper secondary teachers' salaries in OECD countries are $129 \%$ of per capita GDP. In Germany, Turkey, Korea, Portugal, Spain and the partner countries and economies Hong Kong-China, Jordan, Malaysia, Tunisia and Colombia, upper secondary teachers' salaries are between $160 \%$ and $223 \%$ of per capita GDP. By contrast, in the Slovak Republic, Estonia and the partner countries Romania, Indonesia and Latvia, they are between $44 \%$ and $68 \%$ of per capita GDP (Table IV.3.3).

In all school systems, teachers' salaries rise during the course of a career, although the rate of change differs greatly. In Korea and the partner countries and economies Shanghai-China, Malaysia, Jordan, Singapore and Romania, salaries at the top of the scale are 2.5 times higher than starting salaries ${ }^{4}$ and it takes between 20 and 40 years to reach the top salary. In Shanghai-China, this ratio is particularly high: the salary at the top of the scale is 4.5 times greater than the starting salary for lower secondary teachers, and it is 5.6 times greater for upper secondary teachers. By contrast, in Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Finland, Germany, the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, Spain and the partner countries Peru, Montenegro and Croatia, teachers' salaries at the top of the scale is at most 1.4 times higher than starting salaries (Table IV.3.3).

- Figure IV.3.2

Expenditure on education and teachers' salaries


Notes: Teachers' salaries in Belgium are the average teachers' salaries of the French and Flemish communities of Belgium. Teachers' salaries in the United Kingdom are the average teachers' salaries in England and Scotland.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of teachers' salaries (average of lower and upper secondary teachers' salaries).
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.3.1, IV.3.2 and IV.3.3.
StatLink 亦需 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

Higher salaries can help school systems to attract the best candidates to the teaching profession, and they signal that teachers are regarded and treated as professionals. But paying teachers well is only part of the equation: school systems must also nurture and retain the best of their teachers. The next section examines these aspects more in detail.

## HUMAN RESOURCES

According to results described in Chapter 1, schools that suffer from greater levels of teacher shortage tend to have lower scores in PISA.

Teachers are an essential resource for learning: the quality of a school system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. Teachers interact with students daily and help students acquire the knowledge that they are expected to have by the time they leave school. Thus, attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers is a priority for public policy, although the policies related to teachers differ widely across countries (OECD, 2005). The type and quality of the training they receive, as well as the requirements to enter and progress through the teaching profession, have significant consequences on the quality of the teaching force.

## Pre-service teacher training

Competitive examinations are required to enter pre-service teacher training (for public primary and secondary education) in Australia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Korea, Mexico and Turkey and the partner countries and economies Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Indonesia, Lithuania, Macao-China, Romania, Shanghai-China, Chinese Taipei, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam (Table IV.3.4). In Austria, competitive examinations are required only
for teacher training in primary education. Pre-service teacher training is longest in Germany, where teacher pre-service training for primary teachers lasts 5.5 years, between 5.5 and 6.5 years for lower secondary teachers, and 6.5 years for upper secondary teachers. For teaching at primary levels, pre-service training is the shortest (three years) in Austria, Belgium, Spain and Switzerland; for teaching at lower secondary levels it is the shortest (three years) in Belgium; and for teaching at the upper secondary level, pre-service training is the shortest in England (UK) and Israel (3.5 years). A teaching practicum is required as part of pre-service training for primary teachers in all OECD countries except Chile and England (UK), and in all partner countries and economies except Brazil, Jordan and Tunisia. Teaching practicums are also required for lower secondary education in all OECD and partner countries and economies, except Brazil, Chile, England (UK), Jordan, Macao-China and Romania. Teaching practicums are also required for upper secondary education in all OECD and partner countries and economies except Austria, Chile, Denmark, England (UK) and Mexico among OECD countries, and partner countries and economies Brazil, Jordan, Macao-China and Romania.

Countries and economies can be categorised into four groups according to whether their public-school teacher preservice training system requires a competitive examination and by the average duration of the training programme as shown in Figure IV.3.3. ${ }^{5}$ Two groups require no entrance examination. One of these groups has a comparatively short pre-service training programme, and the other group has a comparatively long programme. The two additional groups require a competitive entrance examination, one with a short pre-service training programme and another with a comparatively long programme.

Figure IV.3.3 -
Profiles of teacher pre-service training across countries and economies

|  | No examination to enter pre-service training | Competitive examination to enter pre-service training |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Relatively short duration of pre-service training programme (less than 4.3 years) | Belgium (FI.) <br> Belgium (Fr.) <br> England (UK) <br> Hong Kong-China <br> Iceland <br> Japan <br> Latvia <br> Liechtenstein <br> Montenegro <br> New Zealand <br> Poland <br> Qatar <br> Singapore <br> Sweden <br> United States <br> Uruguay | Australia <br> Bulgaria <br> Croatia <br> Greece <br> Israel <br> Lithuania <br> Macao-China <br> Romania <br> Shanghai-China <br> Chinese Taipei <br> Viet Nam |
| Relatively long duration of pre-service training programme (more than 4.3 years) | Canada <br> Czech Republic <br> Denmark <br> Estonia <br> France <br> Italy <br> Luxembourg <br> Malaysia <br> Netherlands <br> Norway <br> Peru <br> Portugal <br> Scotland (UK) <br> Slovak Republic <br> Spain <br> Switzerland | Austria Colombia Finland Germany Hungary Indonesia Ireland Korea Mexico Turkey |
| Countries and economies with no information on duration and/or examination | Albania <br> Argentina <br> Brazil <br> Chile <br> Costa Rica <br> Jordan <br> Kazakhstan | Russian Federation <br> Serbia <br> Slovenia <br> Thailand <br> Tunisia <br> United Arab Emirates |

[^6]
## Requirements to enter the teaching profession

A competitive examination is required to enter the teaching profession for primary and secondary school in France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Spain, Turkey, the United States and the partner countries and economies Brazil, Colombia, Macao-China, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Shanghai-China, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

A credential or license, in addition to the education diploma, is required to start teaching or to become a fully qualified lower or upper secondary teacher in Australia, Canada, Denmark, England (UK), Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Scotland (UK), Switzerland, the United States and the partner countries and economies Bulgaria, Croatia, Hong Kong-China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Montenegro, Shanghai-China, Chinese-Taipei, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

A teaching practicum is required for lower or upper secondary teachers to obtain a credential/licence or is required after being recruited, during an induction/probation period, in Austria, Canada, Denmark, England (UK), Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Scotland (UK), Spain, Turkey, the United States and the partner countries and economies Colombia, Croatia, Malaysia, Montenegro, Qatar, Romania, Shanghai-China, Chinese Taipei, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

Just over half of the participating countries and economies (18 OECD and 11 partner countries and economies) have a register for lower or upper secondary teachers. A register for teachers is an administrative record that contains a detailed profile of teachers, including such information as their qualifications, experience and career path. Continuing education is compulsory for remaining employed in the teaching profession at the lower and upper secondary levels in Belgium (French community), England (UK), Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Scotland (UK), the United States and the partner countries and economies Croatia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Romania, Shanghai-China, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam (Table IV.3.5).

## Teacher profile and qualifications

How are these policies and requirements exercised at school? PISA 2012 asked school principals to report the composition and qualifications of teachers in their schools. Across OECD countries, the average 15 -year-old student is in a school whose principal reported that $87 \%$ of teachers are fully certified. In 47 participating countries and economies, school principals reported that $80 \%$ of teachers or more are fully certified, while in Colombia and Chile, principals reported that fewer than $20 \%$ of teachers are fully certified. In addition, the average 15 -year-old student in OECD countries attends a school whose principal reported that $85 \%$ of teachers have a university-level qualification (i.e. university or similar qualification). In 48 participating countries and economies, principals reported that more than $80 \%$ of teachers have such a qualification, while in Serbia, Uruguay and Argentina, principals reported that fewer than $20 \%$ of teachers have attained that qualification (Figure IV.3.4 and Table IV.3.6).

## Box IV.3.1. Socio-economically disadvantaged and advantaged schools

Socio-economically disadvantaged and advantaged schools are identified within individual school systems by comparing the average socio-economic status of the students in the system and the average socio-economic status of the students in each school (Monseur and Crahay, 2008). Student socio-economic status is measured by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS).

Within each school system, schools are categorised into three groups:

- socio-economically advantaged schools: schools where the average socio-economic status of 15-year-old students is more advantaged than the average socio-economic status of students in the system as a whole;
- socio-economically average schools: schools where the average socio-economic status of 15 -year-old students is not statistically different from the average socio-economic status of students in the system as a whole; or
- socio-economically disadvantaged schools: schools where the average socio-economic status of 15-year-old students is more disadvantaged than the average socio-economic status of students in the system as a whole.

The difference between a school average and the system average is statistically tested considering the confidence interval for school and system averages. Table IV.3.7 presents the percentage of students allocated to the three groups in PISA 2012. Table II.4.2 in Volume II presents average socio-economic, demographic and academic characteristics of schools in these three groups.

Teachers' profiles and qualifications


## Student-teacher ratio

PISA 2012 asked school principals to report the total number of teachers and students in their schools. ${ }^{6}$ The studentteacher ratio is not equivalent to class size. For example, schools with large special education programmes tend to have many teachers, but the size of regular classes is not reduced by the school's high teacher-student ratio. Also, the amount of preparation time per day allotted to teachers may vary across schools and across school systems. More teachers are needed where more preparation time is given and class size remains constant.

Across OECD countries, the average student attends a school where the student-teacher ratio is 13 students to one teacher. Student-teacher ratios range from over 25 students per teacher in Mexico, Brazil and Colombia, to fewer than 10 students per teacher in Liechtenstein, Portugal, Luxembourg, Greece, Belgium, Poland, Latvia and Kazakhstan (Table IV.3.8).

Student-teacher ratios do not vary much within countries and economies, but in some countries there is a difference of around three or more students per teacher between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools. In Brazil, Turkey, Shanghai-China, Romania, Uruguay and Macao-China, disadvantaged schools tend to have more students per teacher than advantaged schools, while in Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Qatar, Estonia, the Russian Federation, Mexico, Peru and Japan advantaged schools have at least three more students per teacher than disadvantaged schools (Table IV.3.9).

## Teacher shortages

In order to assess how school principals perceive the adequacy of the supply of teachers in their schools, they are asked to report on the extent to which they think instruction in their school is hindered by a lack of qualified teachers and staff in key areas. This information was combined to create a composite index of teacher shortage, such that the index has an average of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 for OECD countries. Higher values on the index indicate principals' perception that there are more problems with instruction because of teacher shortages. Caution is required in interpreting these results: school principals across countries and economies, and even within countries and economies, may have different expectations and benchmarks to determine whether there is a lack of qualified teachers. Nonetheless, these reports provide valuable information that can be used to assess whether schools or school systems are providing their students with adequate human resources.

According to school principals, teacher shortages hindered instruction the most in Luxembourg, Jordan, Thailand, Turkey and Shanghai-China. In these countries and economies, between $31 \%$ and $69 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hindered to some extent or a lot the schools' capacity to provide instruction (the OECD average is $17 \%$ ). By contrast, in Poland, Bulgaria, Portugal, Serbia and Spain relatively few principals reported that teacher shortages hindered instruction. In these countries, only around $1 \%$ to $4 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hindered instruction to some extent or a lot (Figure IV.3.5 and Table IV.3.10).

Teacher shortages vary within countries, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of teacher shortage. Variation is comparatively large in Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Colombia, Kazakhstan, Macao-China and Shanghai-China, while it is comparatively small in Poland, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Slovenia and Serbia (Figure IV.3.5 and Table IV.3.10). In 30 countries and economies, principals in socio-economically disadvantaged schools reported more teacher shortage than those in advantaged schools. Particularly wide gaps between advantaged and disadvantaged schools in teacher shortage are observed in Chinese Taipei, Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Sweden, the Slovak Republic, Shanghai-China, Uruguay, Indonesia, Mexico, Turkey, Serbia, the Czech Republic, Chile, the United States, Ireland, Viet Nam and Peru, where the difference is greater than 0.5 index points (i.e. a half of the standard deviation of this index). In 14 countries and economies, principals of public schools tended to report more teacher shortage than those of private schools. In all of these countries and economies except the United Arab Emirates and Italy, principals of disadvantaged schools reported more teacher shortage than those of advantaged schools (Table IV.3.11).

On average across OECD countries, principals of schools located in rural areas reported more teacher shortage than principals of schools in towns, and they, in turn, reported more teacher shortage than principals of schools in cities. This is observed in Iceland, Mexico and Qatar. However, in the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Chile and Romania, principals of schools located in towns and cities reported similar levels of teacher shortage, while principals of schools located in rural areas reported more teacher shortage than principals of schools in towns. In contrast, principals of schools located in rural areas and in towns reported similar levels of teacher shortage,

Impact of teacher shortage on instruction, school principals' views


Notes: Higher values on the index of teacher shortage indicate greater incidence of teacher shortage. Differences that are significant at the $5 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) are marked with *. Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average index.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.3.10 and IV.3.11
StatLink 牙ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

Continuing education necessary to remain employed as a teacher
Mean percentage of mathematics teachers who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months


Notes: In Iceland, the majority of 15 -year-olds are at the lower secondary level, therefore the information at the lower secondary in Table IV.3.5 is used. Belgium is grouped as "continuing education is compulsory requirement" even though it is not a compulsory requirement in the Flemish community of Belgium.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the percentages.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.3.5 and IV.3.12.

while in Colombia, Australia, Indonesia, Uruguay, Viet Nam, New Zealand, Montenegro, Chinese Taipei, the United Arab Emirates, Peru, Brazil, Norway, Ireland, Finland and Canada, principals of schools located in cities reported less teacher shortage than principals of schools in towns. In 34 countries and economies, the level of teacher shortage reported by principals does not vary by where school is located (Table IV.3.11).

## Teachers' professional development

How is the requirement that teachers pursue continuing education implemented? Across OECD countries, the average 15 -year-old student attends a school whose principal reported that $39 \%$ of those who teach mathematics in his or her school have attended a programme of professional development, with a focus on mathematics, during the previous three months. This proportion varies greatly across countries: in Ireland, Qatar, Thailand, Shanghai-China, Croatia, Singapore, Estonia, the United States, New Zealand and Israel, at least $60 \%$ of teachers attended such a programme, while in Turkey, Hungary, Japan, Colombia, Germany, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Norway, the Slovak Republic and Greece, 25\% of teachers or fewer did so (Figure IV.3.6 and Table IV.3.12). As expected, in those countries where it is compulsory for teachers to participate in continuing education, teachers are more likely to have attended professional development programmes ( $48 \%$ on average) than teachers in those countries/economies where it is not compulsory ( $39 \%$ on average) (as shown in Figure IV.3.6). The timing of the PISA data collection largely affects principals' responses on this proportion since they were asked to report teachers' attendance in professional development programmes during the three months prior to the assessment. For example, if most teachers in a country or economy participate in professional development programmes during summer holidays and the PISA data collection was conducted before the summer break in this country, the reported proportion would be underestimated.

In 18 countries and economies, more mathematics teachers in socio-economically advantaged schools than in disadvantaged schools attended a programme of professional development. The gap is especially wide in Luxembourg, Austria, Turkey, Serbia, Chinese Taipei and Shanghai-China, where the difference between advantaged and disadvantaged schools in the percentage of teachers who attended such a programme during the previous three months is 25 percentage points or more (Table IV.3.13).

On average across OECD countries, mathematics teachers in public schools are more likely (40\%) than those in private schools ( $37 \%$ ) to attend a programme of professional development. This is the case in Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Canada, Thailand, France, Switzerland, Germany and Finland, where the difference ranges from 8 to 40 percentage points. In contrast, in Shanghai-China and Luxembourg, mathematics teachers in private schools are more likely than those in public schools to attend such a programme (Table IV.3.13).

Across OECD countries, there is no difference between schools located in towns and those located in cities, on average, in the likelihood of mathematics teachers attending a programme of professional development. But mathematics teachers in schools in rural areas are less likely to attend such a programme than those in schools located in towns. This is observed in Slovenia, Iceland, Denmark, Hungary, the Slovak Republic, Norway and Mexico. However, in 45 countries and economies, there is no difference among schools located in rural areas, towns and cities in the likelihood of mathematics teachers attending a professional development programme (Table IV.3.13).

## MATERIAL RESOURCES

The educational resources available in a school tend to be related to the system's overall performance as well as schools' average level of performance, according to the results examined in Chapter 1. Furthermore, it is shown that high performing systems tend to allocate resource more equitably between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.

While an adequate physical infrastructure and supply of educational resources does not guarantee good learning outcomes, the absence of such resources could negatively affect learning. What matters for student achievement and other education outcomes is not necessarily the availability of resources, but the quality of those resources and how effectively they are used (Gamoran, Secada and Marrett, 2000).

The PISA 2012 School Questionnaire asked school principals to report on not only the availability of school resources, on how the availability or non-availability of certain school resources affect teaching and learning in their schools.


Notes：Higher values on the index of quality of physical infrastructure indicate better physical infrastructure．Differences that are significant at the $5 \%$ level（p $<0.05$ ）are marked with＊．
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average index
Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Tables IV．3．14 and IV．3．15．
StatLink 房焐品 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957327


## Physical infrastructure and educational resources

School principals were asked to report on whether their schools' capacity to provide instruction was hindered ("not at all", "very little", "to some extent", or "a lot") by a shortage or inadequacy of physical infrastructure, such as school buildings and grounds; heating/cooling and lighting systems; and instructional space, such as classrooms. The responses were combined to create an index of quality of physical infrastructure that has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one in OECD countries. Positive values reflect principals' perceptions that the shortage of physical infrastructure hinders learning to a lesser extent than the OECD average, and negative values indicate that school principals believe the shortage hinders learning to a greater extent.

On average across OECD countries, $65 \%$ to $77 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that shortages or inadequacy of school buildings and grounds, heating/cooling and lighting systems, or instructional spaces do not hinder at all or hinder very little their school's capacity to provide instruction. In Latvia, the Czech Republic, the United States, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Switzerland and Canada, $75 \%$ or more of students are in schools whose principals reported that shortages or inadequacy of school buildings and grounds do not hinder learning at all or hinder learning very little, while in Tunisia, Croatia, Luxembourg, Thailand and Colombia, fewer than 40\% of students are in such school. The variation, between schools, in the quality of physical infrastructure and its effect on instruction reported by principals is notable in Argentina, Uruguay, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Kazakhstan and Brazil, while it is small in Romania, Latvia, the Czech Republic and Liechtenstein (Figure IV.3.7 and Table IV.3.14).

In 27 countries and economies, principals of disadvantaged schools tended to report more shortages or inadequacy of physical infrastructure than did principals of advantaged schools. This difference is of one index point or more on the index of quality of physical infrastructure (i.e. over one standard deviation of the index) in Uruguay, Brazil, Argentina and Costa Rica. In contrast, in Lithuania, the United Kingdom, Latvia, Bulgaria and Slovenia, principals of advantaged schools tended to report more shortages or inadequacy of physical infrastructure than did principals of disadvantaged schools. In 24 countries and economies, principals of public schools tended to report more shortages or inadequacy of physical infrastructure than did principals of private schools. The difference in reporting is over one index point (i.e. over one standard deviation of the index) in Albania, Costa Rica, Brazil, Uruguay, Colombia, Mexico, New Zealand, Argentina, Estonia and Peru. On average across OECD countries, principals in schools located in rural areas tended to report more shortages or inadequacy of physical infrastructure than principals of schools located in towns. However, in 33 countries and economies, the level of shortages or inadequacy of physical infrastructure reported by principals does not vary by where school is located (Figure IV.3.7 and Table IV.3.15).

School principals also reported their perceptions about educational resources in their school. They were asked to report whether their school's capacity to provide instruction was hindered by a shortage or inadequacy of: science laboratory equipment, instructional materials (e.g. textbooks), computers for instruction, Internet connectivity, computer software for instruction, and library materials. The responses were combined to create an index of quality of schools' educational resources that has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one in OECD countries. Positive values reflect principals' perceptions that a shortage of educational resources hinders learning to a lesser extent than the OECD average, and negative values indicate that school principals believe the shortage hinders learning to a greater extent.

An average of around $80 \%$ of students across OECD countries attends schools whose principals reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction was not hindered at all or hindered very little by a shortage or inadequacy of instructional materials or a lack or inadequacy of Internet connectivity. Some $74 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that instruction was not hindered at all or hindered very little by a shortage or inadequacy of library materials. Between $66 \%$ and $69 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that instruction was not hindered at all or was hindered very little by shortages or inadequacy of science laboratory equipment, computer software for instruction or computers for instruction. Principals in Singapore, Qatar and Liechtenstein reported that instruction is not hindered by a shortage of educational resources, while in Colombia, Tunisia, Peru and Costa Rica, principals reported that instruction is hindered to some extent by a shortage of educational resources (Figure IV.3.8 and Table IV.3.16).

In 35 countries and economies, principals of disadvantaged schools reported more shortage or inadequacy of educational resources than did principals of advantaged schools. This difference amounts to more than one index point (i.e. more than one standard deviation) in Peru, Costa Rica, Mexico, Brazil and Indonesia. In contrast, in Finland, principals of disadvantaged schools reported less shortage or inadequacy of educational resources than did those of advantaged schools.

School principals' views on adequacy of educational resources


Notes: Higher values on the index of quality of schools' educational resources indicate better quality of schools' educational resources. Differences that are significant at the $5 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) are marked with *
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average index.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.3.16 and IV.3.17.
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

In 26 countries and economies, principals of public schools reported more shortage or inadequacy of educational resources than did principals of private schools. In 36 countries and economies, the level of shortage or inadequacy of educational resources reported by school principals did not vary according to where the schools are located. On average across OECD countries, principals of schools located in cities reported less shortage or inadequacy of educational resources than did principals of schools located in towns; this is observed in 14 countries and economies. In contrast, in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Iceland and Qatar, principals of schools located in cities reported more shortages or in adequacy of educational resources did those of schools located in towns. In Argentina, Mexico, Chile, Thailand, Peru, Albania, Malaysia and Qatar, principals of schools located in rural areas reported more shortages or inadequacy than did principals of schools in towns (Figure IV.3.8 and Table IV.3.17).

Figure IV.3.9 ■
Equity in allocation of educational resources


Notes: The vertical axis refers to the difference in the index of quality of schools' educational resources between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools (adv. - disadv.).
The horizontal axis refers to the mean index of quality of schools' educational resources.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.3.16 and IV.3.17.
StatLink 㔄的 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

As shown in Figure IV.3.9, among the countries and economies where the average educational resource is below the OECD average, the overall level of educational resources is related to the level of equity in resource allocation between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools. The lower the overall level of schools' educational resources, the greater the gap in educational resources between advantaged and disadvantaged schools. Scarce resources tend to be more concentrated in advantaged schools, and disadvantaged schools tend to suffer from inadequacy
or shortage of resources; and the overall level of schools' educational resources is also related to systems' average performance (correlation coefficient is 0.70 ). By contrast, among countries and economies where the overall level of educational resources is above the OECD average, equity in resource allocation is not necessary linked to the overall level of resources; and the overall level of educational resources is not related to systems' average performance, either (correlation coefficient is 0.12).

School principals were asked to report in detail the number of computers available to students, at school, for educational purposes, and the number of these computers that are connected to the Internet. In Australia, Austria, New Zealand, Macao-China and the United Kingdom, at least one computer per student is available while in Turkey, Indonesia, Montenegro, Malaysia and Brazil five or more students share one computer. In a majority of countries and economies, over $95 \%$ of these computers are connected to the Internet; but in Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Tunisia and Peru, more than one in three of these computers are not connected to the Internet (Table IV.3.18).

Across OECD countries, about one in three students attends a school whose principal reported that less than $10 \%$ of work in class requires Internet access; more than one in two students are in schools where between $10 \%$ and $50 \%$ of work in class requires Internet access; and the remaining students ( $10 \%$ ) attend schools where more than $50 \%$ of work in class requires Internet access (Table IV.3.19).

## Box IV.3.2. Improving in PISA: Tunisia

Tunisia's performance in all three PISA subjects has improved over the past decade: in mathematics, by 3 score points per year; in reading, by 3.8 score points per year; and in science, by 2.2 score points per year. In 2003, the country's mean score in mathematics was 359 points; in 2012, it had improved to 388 points. This improvement reflects a considerable reduction in the proportion of students who scored below Level 2 in mathematics. In 2003, almost four out of five students ( $78 \%$ ) failed to attain this baseline level of proficiency in mathematics; by 2012, this share had shrunk to around two out of three students ( $68 \%$ ). Improvements in mathematics and reading scores are observed among both low- and high-achieving students, while improvements in science scores are seen only among low-achieving students.

Despite these improvements in the learning environment, 15-year-old students in 2012 had more negative dispositions towards school and mathematics than their counterparts in 2003 did; and the share of students who reported that they arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test grew from $38 \%$ in 2003 to $52 \%$ in 2012.

Improvements in performance coincided with improvements in some aspect of the learning environment in Tunisia's schools. Students and principals reported fewer student- and teacher-related factors that hinder learning in 2012 than they did in 2003. In addition, the student-teacher ratio decreased from 19.4 in 2003 to 12.1 in 2012, and students attend schools whose principal is less likely to report that a shortage of teachers, educational material or physical infrastructure hinders student learning. Students are also more exposed to mathematics in school, as the average student in 2012 now spends 26 more minutes per week in mathematics lessons than the average student in 2003 did. Students in 2003 reported spending almost five hours per week on mathematics homework, while students in 2012 reported spending around three-and-a-half hours per week. In 2003, $62 \%$ of students reported that they had repeated a grade; by 2012, $38 \%$ of students so reported; as a result, 15-year old-students at the time of the PISA test in 2012 were more likely to be in upper secondary education than 15-year-olds in PISA 2003. Students in 2012 were also less likely than their counterparts in 2003 to be in schools that group students by ability.

In the 2000s, several policies were adopted with the aim of promoting student learning. The "School of Tomorrow" (École de demain) established the framework for these policies with planned implementation between 2002 and 2007. While the changes received wide support from teachers and parents, they have yet to be fully adopted because of the political uncertainty in Tunisia. Those policies that have been implemented focus on changing the curriculum and changing the way teachers teach. They also foster a culture of evaluation of schools and the school system, one of the reasons why Tunisia began participating in PISA in 2003 and continued to do so in every subsequent assessment.

In line with the PISA results outlined above, mandated teaching time for mathematics at the primary and top-level lower secondary schools was increased from four to five hours per week. The curriculum was further modified to introduce the teaching of physics and information technologies. Teachers were encouraged to modify their teaching methods to emphasise learning through student-directed problem solving and to make better use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in the teaching of Arabic, French, mathematics and sciences. To help teachers adopt of these new methods, national teaching manuals were revised and now include CDs with the relevant software for ICT-supported teaching.

In addition, Tunisia increased its budget for education, spending three times more per student at the secondary level and more than double at the primary level in 2011 than it did in 2001. These additional financial resources are devoted to providing information and communication technologies to schools, reducing class size, raising teachers' salaries, and improving the physical working conditions for teachers.

## Sources :

Mhirsi, C. (2012), Le Système Éducatif Tunisien à travers les Évaluations Internationales, Colloque sur la Méthodologie de la Réforme du Système Éducatif (29-31 mars, 2012), Ministère de L'Éducation, Tunis.
Ministère de l'Éducation (2002), La Nouvelle Réforme du Système Éducatif Tunisien : Programme pour la mise en œuvre du projet "École de demain", Ministère de l'Éducation, Tunis.

## TIME RESOURCES

According to the results discussed in Chapter 1, at the school level, there is some relationship between the time students spend learning in and after school and their performance, but no clear pattern of this relationship is observed across countries and economies. Across all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, high-performing systems offer more creative extracurricular activities, and more students attend pre-primary education, and for a longer period of time, in these systems.

Ever since the seminal study by John B. Carroll (1963) on the extent of learning as a function of the instructional time a student receives relative to the time the student needs, educators and policy makers have attempted to understand how students' hours in school should be organised to maximise learning (Bloom, 1968). The literature suggests that optimising academic learning time is one of the key factors in improving academic achievement (Carroll, 1989; Hawley and Rosenholtz, 1984; Sheerens and Bosker, 1997; Marzano, 2003). The extent of students' exposure to content is the core of the concept of "opportunity to learn" (Schmidt and Maier, 2009), which is discussed in detail in Volume I.

While learning takes place in a variety of formal and informal settings, research indicates that structured lesson time at school is an important pre-requisite for students to develop the competencies that are assessed in the PISA 2012 framework (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Seidel and Shavelson, 2007; OECD, 2013a). Determining how learning time is associated with performance is difficult, given that many factors can influence the productivity of learning time. Yet research finds that the more time students spend learning, on average, the higher their grades (Fisher et al., 1980; Clark and Linn, 2003; Smith, 2002; Lavy, 2010).

What is less straightforward is how after-school lessons and individual study can promote academic achievement or be better organised to develop students' skills. While schools are structured learning environments with less variability than after-school programmes (Entwisle, Alexander and Olson 1997), both the quantity and quality of learning opportunities in informal settings are likely to vary more. Indirect evidence of this comes from studies examining the possible causes of the differences related to socio-economic status in the cognitive skills of young children entering school (Hart and Risley, 1995; Natriello, McDill and Pallas, 1990; Huttenlocher et al., 1991; Jencks and Phillips, 1998; Levin and Belfield, 2002). In these studies, differences in informal learning opportunities can be attributed to: more restricted vocabulary used by adults in the social networks of children coming from disadvantaged backgrounds; lower participation rates in pre-school education among children from disadvantaged backgrounds; the lack of educational resources available to parents with little education; and the fact that the achievement gap between social groups tends to grow during school breaks, reflecting differences in what children are exposed to while they are outside of school and formal learning environments.

## Intended learning time in school

School systems make decisions about the overall amount of time devoted to instruction and what material students should be taught and at what age. Total intended instruction time is an estimate of the number of hours during which students are taught both compulsory and non-compulsory parts of the curriculum, as per public regulations. On average across OECD countries, students are expected to receive an average of around 7700 hours of school (primary and secondary) by the time they are 14 . Most of this instruction time is compulsory (OECD, 2013b). This total intended instruction time for students up to 14 years old ranges from over 9400 hours in Australia, Greece and Chile and the partner country Colombia, to less than 6000 hours in Estonia, Finland, Poland and Sweden and the partner countries and economies Argentina, Lithuania, Latvia, Croatia, the Russian Federation, Hong Kong-China, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Tunisia and Albania (Table IV.3.20).

Some systems allocate more learning time for older students than younger students, while other systems do the opposite. In the Czech Republic, Mexico, Hungary, Korea and the partner countries and economies the Russian Federation, Indonesia, Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Lithuania, Croatia, Macao-China and Latvia, the average number of hours per year of total intended instruction time for students between 12 and 14 years is more than that for students up to 9 years old (between 1.4 and 1.9 times more). By contrast, in Greece, Luxembourg, Turkey and the partner country Uruguay, the average number of hours per year of total intended instruction time for students aged between 12 and 14 is less than that for students up to 9 years old (between 0.67 and 0.98 times less) (Table IV.3.20).

## Students' learning time in regular school lessons

PISA 2012 asked students to report the average number of minutes per class period and the number of class periods per week for mathematics, language of instruction and science. ${ }^{7}$ Across OECD countries, students reported spending 3 hours and 38 minutes per week in mathematics lessons, 3 hours and 35 minutes per week in language-of-instruction classes, and 3 hours and 20 minutes per week in science lessons (Figure IV.3.10 and Table IV.3.21).

Student learning time in regular lessons varies greatly across school systems. Students in Chile spend around 6 hours and 40 minutes and students in Canada and the United Arab Emirates spend around 5 hours and 15 minutes in regular mathematics lessons per week. By contrast, students in Bulgaria, Montenegro, Croatia and Hungary spend less than 2 hours and 30 minutes in regular mathematics lessons per week. Meanwhile, students in Chile spend 6 hours and 14 minutes per week and students in Canada, Denmark and Tunisia spend between 5 hours and 6 minutes and 5 hours and 16 minutes per week in language-of-instruction classes. By contrast, students in Kazakhstan spend 1 hour and 49 minutes per week and students in the Russian Federation, Uruguay, Thailand, Bulgaria, Austria and Serbia spend between 2 hours and 15 minutes and 2 hours 25 minutes per week in language-of-instruction classes. Students in the United Arab Emirates and Canada spend 5 hours and 6 minutes; students in Lithuania spend 5 hours and 21 minutes per week in science lessons. By contrast, students in Montenegro spend 1 hour and 45 minutes, students in Italy spend 2 hours and 16 minutes, and students in Iceland spend 2 hours and 21 minutes per week in science lessons (Figure IV.3.10 and Table IV.3.21).

Students in school systems that provide an above-average amount of learning time in mathematics classes also tend to spend an above-average learning time in language of instruction lessons ( $r=0.85$ across OECD countries and $r=0.82$ across all participating countries and economies). Students in systems that provide above-average learning time in regular mathematics lessons tend to spend more time in regular science lessons ( $r=0.59$ across OECD countries and $r=0.51$ across all participating countries and economies). However, in some systems, such as those in Bulgaria and Lithuania, students spend less-than-average time in regular mathematics lessons, while they spend more-than-average time in regular science lessons.

Even within individual school systems, the amount of learning time in regular lessons, as reported by 15 -year-old students, can vary. In most school systems, there is greater variation in learning time in regular science lessons than in regular mathematics or reading lessons. In Greece, Slovenia, Poland, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Hungary, Finland and Serbia, the amount of learning time that students spend in regular mathematics lessons does not vary much, while in Chile, Peru, the United Arab Emirates, Argentina, Tunisia, Indonesia, Colombia and the United States, there are notable differences (Table IV.3.21).

On average across OECD countries, students who are in socio-economically disadvantaged schools tend to spend fewer minutes in regular mathematics lessons than students in advantaged schools. This is true in many countries and economies, especially in Japan, Chinese Taipei and Argentina, where students in advantaged schools spend an average of over 76 minutes more per week in regular mathematics lessons than students in disadvantaged schools. However, the opposite is observed in the United Arab Emirates, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, the United Kingdom and Qatar, where students in disadvantaged schools spend an average of between 5 to 35 minutes more per week in regular mathematics lessons than students in advantaged schools (Table IV.3.22).

Figure IV.3.10


## Student learning time in school and after school

Learning time in regular mathematics lessons
Learning time in regular language-of-instruction lessons
Learning time in regular science lessons
Homework or other study set by teachers
Work with a personal tutor, whether paid or not
$\diamond$ Attend after-school classes organised by a commercial company, and paid for by parents
Study with a parent or other family member


[^7]These differences in learning time between disadvantaged and advantaged schools are also related to other school features, such as differences in learning time between lower or upper secondary levels, public or private schools, or academic or vocational schools, depending on the structure of individual school systems. As shown in Chapter 2, socioeconomically disadvantaged students are, in general, more likely to repeat a grade, so they have a greater chance of being enrolled at the lower secondary level in some systems. Whether students in lower secondary school spend more time learning mathematics than those at the upper secondary level depends on the education system. For example, in Argentina students at the upper secondary level spend 40 minutes more per week in regular mathematics class than students in lower secondary school, while in Switzerland students at the lower secondary level spend 59 minutes more per week in regular mathematics class than students in upper secondary school (Table IV.3.22)

Because the PISA sample is age-based, students are drawn from various grade levels and from both lower and upper secondary levels. It is important to keep this in mind when comparing the amount of time students invest in reading, mathematics and science lessons, because these lessons may be compulsory at one level (and hence in one school system, depending on the education level 15 -year-old students attend) and not in the other (see also Box IV.1.1).

## Class size

Class size can affect learning in various ways. Large classes may limit the time and attention teachers can devote to individual students, rather than to the whole class; and they may also be more prone to disturbances from noisy and disruptive students. As a result, teachers may have to adopt different pedagogical styles to compensate, which may, in turn, affect learning. While some research shows that smaller classes can improve non-cognitive skills (Dee and West, 2011), research on class size has generally found a weak relationship between small classes and better performance (Ehrenberg et al., 2001; Piketty and Valdenaire, 2006). Class size seems to be more important in the earlier years of schooling than it is for 15-year-olds (Finn, 1998; Chetty et al., 2011; Dynarski, Hyman and Schanzenbach, 2011). Moreover, the effects of class size on student performance seem to be culture-specific: comparatively large classes are found in many Asian countries where average student performance is high.

Students were asked to report the average number of students who attend their language-of-instruction class. On average across OECD countries, there are 24 students in a language-of-instruction class. In Viet Nam, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Thailand, Shanghai-China and Macao-China, there are 35 or more students per class, while in Liechtenstein, Finland, Latvia, Belgium, Switzerland, Iceland, Kazakhstan and Denmark there are fewer than 20 students. Class size varies greatly in Mexico, Jordan and Thailand, while in Greece, Finland, Denmark, Romania, Poland, Luxembourg, Italy, Croatia and Portugal language-of-instruction classes for 15 -year-olds are roughly the same size (Table IV.3.23).

Classes in advantaged schools tend to be larger than those in disadvantaged schools by four students, on average across OECD countries. This is true in 51 countries and economies, while in Singapore, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, classes in advantaged schools tend to be smaller than those in disadvantaged schools. There is no difference in class size between public and private schools, on average across OECD countries; and upper secondary students tend to be in larger classes than lower secondary students, on average across OECD countries. This is true in 29 countries and economies, while the opposite is observed in Germany, Turkey, Singapore, Australia, Kazakhstan, Israel, the Russian Federation, Qatar and Ireland. On average across OECD countries, the size of classes in schools located in rural areas tend to be smaller than those in schools located in towns or cities, and there is no difference in class size between classes in schools located in towns and those in schools located in cities (Table IV.3.24).

## Students' learning time in after-school lessons

Students were asked to report the number of hours they typically spend per week attending after-school lessons in mathematics, language of instruction and science. These are lessons that may be given at their school, at their home or somewhere else. Across OECD countries, students are more likely to attend after-school lessons in mathematics than in language of instruction or science. Around $73 \%$ of students reported that they do not attend after-school lessons in the language of instruction or science; more students attend after-school mathematics lessons, while $62 \%$ of students reported that they did not attend such lessons, another $30 \%$ of students reported that they attend after-school mathematics lessons, but for less than four hours per week, and $8 \%$ of students attend such lessons for four or more hours per week (Table IV.3.25).

Students' attendance in after-school lessons varies greatly across countries. In Viet Nam, Tunisia, Malaysia, Peru, Shanghai-China, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Japan, around $70 \%$ or more of students attend after-school lessons in mathematics. In Viet Nam, Tunisia and Peru, between $28 \%$ and $36 \%$ of students attend these lessons for four hours or more per week.

Figure IV.3.11
Attendance in after-school lessons

|  | Percentage of students attending after-school mathematics lessons: <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> All students |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Socio-economically advantaged students (top quarter of ESCS) |  |
| $\square$ | Socio-economically disadvantaged students (bottom quarter of ESCS) |



[^8]By contrast, in Norway, Austria, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Slovenia, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland and the United States, 70\% or more of students do not attend after-school lessons in mathematics. In these countries, between $2 \%$ and $7 \%$ of students attend these lessons for four hours or more per week (Figure IV.3.11 and Table IV.3.25). The nature and purpose of after-school lessons vary. In some schools and school systems, after-school lessons are provided mainly to support struggling students, while in others they are mainly for enrichment.

On average across OECD countries, socio-economically advantaged students are more likely to attend after-school lessons in mathematics ( $40 \%$ ) than disadvantaged students ( $36 \%$ ). This is true in 25 countries and economies; in Chinese Taipei, Greece and Japan, the difference is between 27 and 30 percentage points. By contrast, in Mexico, Norway and Denmark, the opposite is observed: the proportion of disadvantaged students who attend after-school lessons in mathematics is larger than that of advantaged students by 5 percentage points or more. Across OECD countries, lower secondary students are more likely to attend after-school lessons in mathematics than upper secondary students, on average; and students who attend schools in a city are more likely to attend these lessons than students in schools located in other areas (Figure IV.3.11 and Table IV.3.26).

Students were also asked to report the average time they spend each week on various types of after-school study activities, all school subjects combined. Across OECD countries, students reported that they spend 4.9 hours per week on homework or other study set by their teacher. Of this time, 1.3 hours are spent with another person overseeing the study and providing help if necessary, either at school or elsewhere. Students also reported that they spend 39 minutes per week working with a personal tutor, and 37 minutes per week attending after-school classes organised by a commercial company and paid for by their parents (Figure IV.3.10 and Table IV.3.27).

Students in Shanghai-China, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Kazakhstan, Italy, Ireland and Romania reported that they spend at least seven hours per week on homework or other study set by their teachers. In Shanghai-China, students spend almost 14 hours per week. By contrast, in Finland, Korea, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Liechtenstein, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Tunisia, Sweden, Argentina, Slovenia, Portugal and Japan, students spend less than four hours per week on this. Students in Kazakhstan, Indonesia, Tunisia, Albania, Greece, the United Arab Emirates and Singapore reported that they spend two hours per week or more working with a personal tutor. Students in Viet Nam, Korea, Greece, Malaysia, Indonesia, Albania, Kazakhstan and Shanghai-China reported that they spend more than two hours per week attending after-school classes organised by a commercial company and paid for by their parents.

Hours that students spend doing homework or other study set by teachers vary between schools. On average across OECD countries, students who attend socio-economically advantaged schools tend to spend two hours per week longer on this than students who attend disadvantaged schools. This is true in 59 countries and economies. Across OECD countries, students in private schools spend more time doing homework or other study set by teachers than students in public schools, on average; upper secondary students spend more time on this than lower secondary students; students in schools located in cities spend more time than students in schools located in towns; and students in schools in cities or towns spend more time on this than students in schools located in rural areas (Table IV.3.28).

Some schools organise extra mathematics lessons at school. School principals reported on whether their school offers mathematics lessons in addition to the mathematics lessons offered during the usual school hours. Across OECD countries, two out of three students attend schools whose principals reported that such additional mathematics lessons are offered. In the Russian Federation, Hong Kong-China, Luxembourg, Viet Nam, Serbia, Macao-China, the United Kingdom, Kazakhstan, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand, over $90 \%$ of students are in schools that offer these kinds of additional mathematics lessons, while fewer than half of students in Greece, Norway, Colombia, Denmark, Spain, Peru, Turkey, Costa Rica, Austria and Shanghai-China attend such schools (Table IV.3.29).

The additional mathematics lessons that are offered in some schools are usually for both enrichment and remedial purposes. Across OECD countries, $54 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that the school offers enrichment and remedial mathematics lessons. Another $32 \%$ of students are in schools that offer remedial mathematics lessons only. Some $6 \%$ of students are in schools that offer enrichment mathematics lessons only. The remaining 7\% of students are in schools that offer additional mathematics lessons based on the prior achievement level of the students. In most participating countries and economies, offering both enrichment and remedial mathematics lessons appears to be most common. However, in Luxembourg, Austria, the Netherlands, Spain, Chile, Belgium and Denmark, offering remedial mathematics lessons only is more common than offering both remedial and enrichment lessons. In these countries, there is at least an 18 percentage-point difference in the proportion of students in schools that offer remedial lessons only and those in schools that offer both remedial and enrichment lessons (Table IV.3.29).

Figure IV．3．12
Extracurricular activities

## Creative extracurricular activities at school

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following activities are offered at school

Band，orchestra or choir
School play or school musical
Art club or art activities


Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average index
Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Tables IV．3．31 and IV．3．32．
StatLink 交亚经 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957327

## Extracurricular activities

Instruction doesn't just occur inside classroom walls; extracurricular activities, such as sports activities and teams, debate clubs, academic clubs, bands, orchestras or choirs, can improve students' cognitive and non-cognitive skills. Skills such as persistence, independence, following instructions, working well within groups, dealing with authority figures, and fitting in with peers are needed for students to succeed in school - and beyond (Farkas, 2003; Carneiro and Heckman, 2005; Covay and Carbonaro, 2009, Howie et al., 2010).

School principals were asked to report whether their school offers various extracurricular activities to students in the modal grade for 15 -year-olds. Across OECD countries, $90 \%$ of students are in schools that support a sports team or sporting activities; $73 \%$ are in schools that offer volunteering or service activities; $67 \%$ are in schools that offer mathematics competitions; $63 \%$ are in schools that support a band, orchestra or choir; $62 \%$ are in schools that offer an art club or art activities; $59 \%$ are in schools that produce a school play or musical; $56 \%$ are in schools that support a school yearbook, newspaper or magazine; $38 \%$ are in schools that support a club with a focus on computers and information and communications technologies (ICT); $30 \%$ are in schools that support a chess club; and $27 \%$ are in schools that support a mathematics club (Table IV.3.30).

Some of the principals' responses to these questions were combined to create two indices. One is an index of creative extracurricular activities at school, which is the sum of principals' responses on whether schools offer: band, orchestra or choir; school play or school musical; and art club or art activities. The other index is an index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school, which is the sum of principals' responses on whether schools offer: mathematics club; mathematics competitions; club with a focus on computers and ICT; and one more separate question regarding the availability of additional mathematics lessons (for remedial only, for enhancement only, or for both remedial and enhancement), which was described in the previous section. The index of creative extracurricular activities at school ranges from 0 to 3 , as this is the sum of availability of three activities, and the index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school ranges from 0 to 5 , as this is the sum of five activities (see Annex A1).

As shown in Figure IV.3.12, in Macao-China, Hong Kong-China and the United Kingdom, schools tend to offer more creative extracurricular activities (in these countries and economies, the index score ranges from 2.75 to 2.78), while schools in Norway, Spain, Argentina, Austria, Denmark and the Czech Republic do not offer many creative extracurricular activities (in these countries and economies, the index score ranges from 0.68 to 1.16). In 20 countries and economies, schools offer three or more out of five extracurricular mathematics activities, on average, while schools in Hong Kong-China, Poland, Malaysia and Korea offer four or more of these activities, on average. By contrast, schools in Denmark, Norway, Austria, the Netherlands, Liechtenstein, Spain, Switzerland and Greece offer fewer than one-and-a-half of these activities. School systems in which schools offer more creative extracurricular activities also tend to offer more extracurricular mathematics activities ( $r=0.58$ across OECD countries and $r=0.52$ across all participating countries and economies).

## Students' attendance at pre-primary school

Whether and for how long students are enrolled in pre-primary education is another important aspect of time resources invested in education. Many of the inequalities that exist within school systems are already present when students first enter formal schooling and persist as students progress through schooling (Entwisle, Alexander and Olson 1997; Downey, Von Hippel and Broh 2004; Mistry et al., 2010). Because research shows that inequalities tend to grow when students are not attending school such as during long school breaks (Entwisle, Alexander and Olson, 1997; Alexander, Entwisle and Olson, 2001; Downey, Von Hippel and Broh, 2004), earlier entry into the school system may reduce inequalities in education - as long as participation in pre-primary schooling is universal and the learning opportunities across pre-primary schools are of high quality and relatively homogeneous. Earlier entry into pre-primary school prepares students better for entry into - and success in - formal schooling (Hart and Risley, 1995; Heckman, 2000; Chetty et al., 2011).

Across OECD countries, $93 \%$ of students reported that they had attended pre-primary education. In 52 participating countries and economies, over $80 \%$ of students reported that they had attended pre-primary education. However, in Indonesia, Tunisia and Montenegro, between $32 \%$ and $46 \%$ of students reported that they had not attended pre-primary education, as did $70 \%$ of students in Turkey and $65 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan. In general, most students had attended pre-primary education for more than one year: across OECD countries, $74 \%$ of students reported that they had attended pre-primary education for more than one year. In 24 participating countries and economies, over $80 \%$ of students reported that they had attended pre-primary education for more than one year (Table IV.3.33).

An average of $67 \%$ of students in socio-economically disadvantaged schools had attended pre-primary education for more than one year, while $81 \%$ of students in advantaged schools had done so. This is true in almost all participating countries and economies. The difference is around 44 percentage points in Poland and Lithuania and between 39 and 30 percentage points in Croatia, Kazakhstan, Argentina, Finland and Malaysia. On average across OECD countries, students in private schools ( $79 \%$ ) are more likely than students in public schools $(73 \%)$ to have attended pre-primary education for more than one year; 15-year-old upper secondary students ( $73 \%$ ) are more likely than lower secondary students ( $68 \%$ ) to have attended pre-primary school; and students in schools located in towns or cities are more likely to attend pre-primary school than students in schools located in rural areas (Table IV.3.34).

Box IV.3.3 describes how indices like the index of quality of schools' educational resources are compared across PISA assessments.

## Box IV.3.3. Comparing PISA scale indices between 2003 and 2012

PISA scale indices, like the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status, the index of teacher shortage, the index of quality of physical infrastructure, the index of quality of educational resources, the index of disciplinary climate, the index of teacher-student relations, the index of teacher morale, the index of student-related factors affecting school climate and the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate, are based on information gathered from the student questionnaire. In PISA 2012, each index is scaled so that a value of 0 indicates the OECD average and a value of 1 indicates the average standard deviation across OECD countries (see Annex A1 for details on how each index is constructed). Similarly, in PISA 2003, each index was scaled so that a value of 0 indicated the OECD average and a value of 1 indicated the average standard deviation across OECD countries. To compare the evolution of these indices over time, the PISA 2012 scale was used and all index values for PISA 2003 were rescaled accordingly. As a result, the values of the indices for 2003 presented in this report differ from those produced in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## TRENDS IN RESOURCES INVESTED IN EDUCATION SINCE PISA 2003

Overall, most countries and economies with comparable data between 2003 and 2012 have moved towards betterstaffed and better-equipped schools. Trends between 2003 and 2012 also reveal an increase in classroom instruction time dedicated to mathematics and a reduction in the time students spend doing mathematics homework. Fifteen-year-old students in 2012 were also more likely than 15-year-olds in 2003 to have attended at least one year of pre-primary education. ${ }^{8}$

Between 2001 and 2010, financial investment in education increased significantly. On average across OECD countries with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, ${ }^{9}$ national cumulative expenditure per student from the age of 6 to the age of 15 increased by $40 \%$ in real terms. Increases in cumulative expenditure per student are notable in the Slovak Republic, where investments nearly tripled during the period, and in Ireland and Poland, where they doubled. Moreover, in most countries and economies, growth in investment in education for students up to the age of 15 outpaced GDP growth, signalling that countries have privileged spending on education. Only in Iceland, Mexico and Italy did real cumulative expenditure decrease during the period (Tables IV.3.1 and IV.3.2).

On average across OECD countries with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, there has been a reduction in student-teacher ratios. In 2003, the average 15 -year-old student attended a school with student-teacher ratio of 13.4 students per teacher; by 2012 this ratio had dropped to 12.6 students per teacher. Of the 36 countries and economies with comparable data for this period, 21 saw a reduction in student-teacher ratios, particularly Macao-China, Tunisia and Brazil, where the average student in 2012 attended a school where there were at least five fewer students per teacher than there were in 2003 (Tunisia's improvement in PISA and recent education policies and programmes is outlined in Box IV.3.2). By contrast, Hungary, the Netherlands, Denmark and Liechtenstein are the only countries with comparable data that saw an increase in student-teacher ratios during this period (Figure IV.3.13 and Table IV.3.35). The overall reduction in student-teacher ratios observed across OECD countries with comparable data applies to advantaged and disadvantaged students, advantaged and disadvantaged schools, private and public schools, lower and upper secondary students, and schools located in rural, town or urban areas (Table IV.3.36).

Figure IV.3.13 ■
Change between 2003 and 2012 in average student-teacher ratios


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The change in student-teacher ratios (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown. OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable results in 2012 and 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the student-teacher ratio in PISA 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.3.35.
StatLink (inlst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

School principals' reports also signal trends towards better-staffed schools. Students in 2012 were less likely than students in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that a lack of qualified teachers hinders learning. On average across OECD countries, students in 2012 were around five percentage points less likely than students in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hinders instruction. In 2003, more than one in two students in Turkey, Luxembourg, Uruguay and Indonesia, attended schools whose principal signalled that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hindered learning; in 2012 this was the case only for students in Luxembourg, among all countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. Reductions in teacher shortages were observed in 20 of the 38 countries and economies with comparable data for the period. The largest reductions in teacher shortages were observed in Turkey and Indonesia, where students in 2012 were at least 35 percentage points less likely than students in 2003 to attend schools whose principals reported that a lack of qualified mathematics, science or language-of-assessment teachers hindered instruction to some extent or a lot. However, increases in teacher shortages are observed in eight countries and economies (Table IV.3.37). In Korea, for example, students in 2012 were ten percentage points more likely than students in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that a lack of qualified mathematics teachers hindered instruction to some extent or a lot. The fact that instruction was less hindered by a lack of qualified teachers in 2012 than in 2003, on average among OECD countries, was also observed across advantaged and disadvantaged schools, public and private schools, lower and upper secondary school programmes, and in schools located in rural, town or urban areas, on average (Table IV.3.39).

More school principals in 2012 than in 2003 reported that schools are in good physical condition. On average across the OECD countries with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, students are significantly less likely to attend schools whose principal reported that the inadequacy or shortage of school buildings, heating or cooling systems or instructional space hindered the capacity to provide instruction by six, four and five percentage points, respectively. Deterioration in the quality of overall material conditions, as measured by the index of quality of physical infrastructure were observed in 22 of the 38 countries with comparable data, particularly in Turkey. In Tunisia, Thailand and Korea more school principals in 2012 than in 2003 reported that the quality of the physical infrastructure - particularly a lack of sufficient instructional space - hindered learning (Table IV.3.40). The average positive trend among OECD countries
with comparable data, that instruction is less hindered by a lack of adequate physical infrastructure, is observed in both
 advantaged and disadvantaged schools, public and private schools, lower and upper secondary school programmes, and schools located in rural, town or urban areas, on average (Table IV.3.42).

Students in 2012 are also less likely than their counterparts were in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered by a lack of instructional materials. In 29 of the 38 countries and economies with comparable data, there is an increase in the index of quality of schools' educational resources, with the largest improvements observed in Turkey, Poland, Uruguay and the Russian Federation. In Turkey, for example, students are more than 40 percentage points less likely to attend schools whose principal reported that a lack of instructional materials (e.g. textbooks) or computer software for instruction hinders the school's capacity to provide instruction. By contrast, the index of quality of schools' educational resources fell - signalling a greater likelihood that students attend schools where a lack of material resources hinders the school's capacity to provide instruction - in Tunisia, Korea and Iceland (Figure IV.3.14 and Table IV.3.43). The overall trend among OECD countries, that a lack of educational resources hinders the school's capacity to provide instruction to a lower extent in 2012 than in 2003, was observed across all school types (advantaged and disadvantaged students, advantaged and disadvantaged schools, private and public schools, lower and upper secondary programmes, and urban and rural schools) (Table IV.3.45).

- Figure IV.3.14 -

Change between 2003 and 2012 in the index of quality of schools' educational resources (e.g. textbooks)


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The change in the index of quality of schools' educational resources (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of quality of schools' educational resources have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this figure may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 a ) (see Annex A5 for more details).
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable results in 2012 and 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the mean index of quality of schools' educational resources in PISA 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.3.43.
StatLink 甸ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

Across OECD countries, students spent an average of 13 minutes per week more in mathematics classes in 2012 than they did in 2003. Average time spent in regular school lessons in mathematics per week increased by more than an hour-and-a-half in Portugal and Canada, and by more than 30 minutes in Spain, Norway and the United States. As a result of these changes, mathematics instruction for 15-year-olds in Portugal increased from an average of 3 hours and 15 minutes
per week to 4 hours and 48 minutes per week. In Canada, average mathematic instruction time increased from 3 hours and 43 minutes to around 5 hours and 14 minutes. Increases in exposure to mathematics between 2003 and 2012 by more than 15 minutes per week when comparing are observed in an additional 14 countries and economies. In contrast, average learning time in mathematics shrank in ten countries and economies. Only in Korea - which had the fifth longest amount of learning time in 2003 - did the total learning time in mathematics fall by more than 30 minutes. Average weekly instruction time in mathematics also decreased in Turkey, Uruguay, Indonesia, Thailand and the Slovak Republic by at least 15 minutes per week. Countries and economies that saw an increase in weekly mathematics instruction time are not necessarily those that had shorter instruction time in 2003 (the correlation between instruction time in 2003 and change in instruction time between 2003 and 2012 is weak at -0.14) (Figure IV.3.15 and Table IV.3.46). The overall trend among OECD countries, that students spend more time in mathematics classes, is observed across all school types (advantaged and disadvantaged, private and public, lower and upper secondary programmes, and urban and rural schools) (Tables IV.3.47[1] and IV.3.47[2]).

- Figure IV.3.15 ■

Change between 2003 and 2012 in the average time spent in mathematics lessons in school


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The change in learning time (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown. OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable results in 2012 and 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average minutes students spent in mathematics lessons in school per week in PISA 2012. Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.3.46.
StatLink 京ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

Trends also show that students spend less time on homework in 2012 that their counterparts in 2003 did. In 2003 and across OECD countries that had comparable data from 2003 and 2012, 15-year-old students reported spending 5.9 hours per week on homework or other study set by teachers. By 2012, this time had shrunk by one hour a week, to 4.9 hours. Average time spent on homework decreased in 31 of the 38 countries and economies with comparable data. It shrank by more than five hours per week in the Slovak Republic and by more than three hours per week in Hungary, Latvia and Greece. These reductions tend to be greatest among those countries and economies that recorded the most number of hours spent on homework in 2003 (correlation between average time spent in homework in 2003 and change to 2012 of -0.68). In 2003 in the Russian Federation, Italy and Hungary, the average student reported spending more than ten hours per week on homework; by 2012, the number of hours spent doing homework dropped by around two hours per week in Italy and by around three hours per week in the Russian Federation and Hungary. An exception to this trend
is Finland, where the average student in 2003 spent a relatively short time doing homework ( 3.7 hours per week) and in 2012, the average student spent almost one hour less on homework. As a result of these changes, the difference in time spent on homework between those countries where students do more homework and those where students do less has narrowed over time (Figure IV.3.16 and Table IV.3.48). The general trend among OECD countries, that students spend less time doing homework in 2012 than they did in 2003, was observed among both advantaged and disadvantaged students and across all school types (advantaged and disadvantaged, private and public, lower and upper secondary programmes, and urban and rural schools) (Table IV.3.49).

- Figure IV.3.16

Change between 2003 and 2012 in the average time spent doing homework


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The change in time spent doing homework (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown. OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable results in 2012 and 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the average time students spent doing homework in PISA 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.3.48.
StatLink 可ilsta http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957327

Fifteen-year-old students' mathematics (and reading) achievement is related to their school readiness when they entered primary school (Duncan et al., 2008). Depending on the quality of the programme, pre-primary school can promote school readiness, particularly if these programmes last more than one year. In PISA 2003, and on average across the OECD countries that have comparable data between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, 69\% of 15-year-olds reported that they had attended a pre-primary school for more than one year; in 2012, $75 \%$ of students reported so. The United States saw an increase of more than 60 percentage points in the share of students who had attended pre-primary school for more than one year: while the great majority of 15-year-old students in 2003 had attended pre-primary school for one year or less, around three out of four 15-year-old students in 2012 had done so for more than one year. Increases in the share of students who had attended pre-primary school for more than one year are notable in Latvia, where the share of students who had attended pre-primary school for more than one year increased by almost 20 percentage points, with a similar reduction in the share of students who had not attended pre-primary school (Table IV.3.50).

Similarly, in 2012, 15-year-old students in Thailand, Denmark, Sweden and Ireland were at least ten percentage points more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to have attended pre-primary school for at least a year. By contrast, attendance in pre-primary school for more than one year declined significantly in the Russian Federation, Finland, Tunisia, Korea and France during the period. In the Russian Federation, attendance in pre-primary school for any period of time dropped by more than five percentage points, while in Tunisia, the four percentage-point drop is offset by a nine percentage-point reduction in the share of 15 -year-olds who had not attended pre-primary education (Table IV.3.50).

The general trend observed among OECD countries, that a larger proportion of 15-year-old students had spent at least a year in pre-primary school, was observed among both advantaged and disadvantaged students, as well as in disadvantaged and advantaged schools, public and private schools, lower and upper secondary programmes, and urban and rural schools. The growth in this enrolment is significantly stronger among advantaged students than disadvantaged students, and among students attending advantaged schools than those attending disadvantaged schools. This signals that those students who could benefit the most from attending pre-primary education (i.e. those from disadvantaged backgrounds) are those who have benefited the least from the greater enrolment in pre-primary education (Table IV.3.51).

## Notes

1. This only covers expenditure on educational institutions.
2. These resources are allocated throughout a student's educational career, and countries spend different amounts per student. Caution is required in interpreting this indicator, as school systems are organised in many different ways across countries. For example, some school systems include special education in school budgets while others don't. Some school systems sponsor extensive recreational, athletic, and extra-curricular activities that are not related to the kind of academic instruction. In addition, some countries require schools to pay the pensions and health insurance of school staff, while others include these costs in the national budget for all citizens.
3. This refers to the scheduled annual salary of a full-time classroom teacher with the minimum training necessary to be fully qualified, plus 15 years of experience.
4. Starting salaries refer to the average scheduled gross salary per year for a full-time teacher with the minimum training necessary to be fully qualified at the beginning of the teaching career. Maximum salaries refer to the maximum annual salary (top of the salary scale) for a full-time classroom teacher with the maximum qualifications recognised for compensation.
5. These groups are created using a cluster analysis with the Ward method (which groups countries and economies to minimise the variance within each cluster) using data available in Table IV.3.4. Variables that entered the analyses are: whether competitive examinations are required to enter pre-service teacher training (coded as 1 for "Yes" and 0 for " $\mathrm{No}^{\prime \prime}$ and taken as the average of the requirement in the primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels); the duration of teacher-training programmes in years (as an average of the duration of training leading to teaching in the primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels; when more than one duration is available for a particular level, the average is also taken); and the requirement of a practicum as part of pre-service training (coded as 1 for "Yes" and 0 for "No" and taken as the average of the requirement in the primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels). Information for the duration of teacher-training programmes is unavailable for Brazil, Chile and the United Arab Emirates, so these countries are excluded from the cluster analysis.
6. Annex A1 provides detailed information on how student-teacher ratio is computed.
7. Based on these two sets of questions, the minutes per week that students spend learning mathematics, language of instruction and science in regular lessons are computed.
8. Although questions included in the PISA 2003 questionnaires allow for trend comparisons in resources invested in education, not all questions are common to both questionnaires. In particular, there were no comparable questions on teachers' continuing education programmes, teacher qualifications, class size, extracurricular activities or after-school learning.
9. Data for PISA 2003 come from Education at a Glance 2004: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2004b) and refer to the year 2001. Data for PISA 2012 come from Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) and refer to the year 2010. Results for the year 2001 have been adjusted by inflation to ensure comparability with 2010.
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## School Governance, Assessments and Accountability

This chapter explores the inter-relationships among school autonomy, school competition, public and private management of schools, school leadership, parental involvement, and assessment and accountability arrangements. The chapter also discusses trends since 2003 in school governance, assessments and accountability.

This chapter examines the balance between autonomy, accountability and collaboration among schools, teachers and parents by describing school autonomy, school competition, public and private involvement in schools, school leadership, parental involvement, and assessment and accountability arrangements.

Chapter 1 shows that the relationship between school governance and education outcomes is complex. At the school level, the relationships vary greatly, depending on the system. At the system level, school systems with high overall performance tend to grant more autonomy to schools in designing curricula and assessments and seek feedback from students for quality-assurance and improvement. In systems with more competition among schools, the impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance is stronger, while that impact is weaker in systems where more schools seek feedback from students and use teacher mentoring as part of quality-assurance and improvement activities.

Governance, assessment and accountability as covered in PISA 2012


## What the data tell us

- In most countries, few individual schools have a major influence on teachers' salaries; however school principals and/or teachers have more responsibility for decisions related to selecting and hiring teachers, and determining course content.
- School systems in which more schools seek written feedback from students about lessons, teachers or resources tend to be more equitable.
- Between 2003 and 2012, students in most (27 out of 38) countries and economies became more likely to be in schools that use student assessments to compare the school's performance to that of other schools. During the same period, students in most countries and economies also became more likely to attend schools that use student assessment data to monitor teacher practice.
- If offered a choice of schools for their child, parents are more likely to consider such criteria as "a safe school environment" and "a school's good reputation" more important than "high academic achievement of students in the school".


## GOVERNANCE OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS

## School autonomy

Chapter 1 shows that systems where schools have more autonomy over curricula and assessments tend to perform better overall. Relationships between school autonomy and performance within countries are more complex, and the relationships vary according to the extent of accountability arrangements that systems have.

Among the many decisions that school systems and schools have to make, those concerning the curriculum and the way resources are allocated and managed have a direct impact on teaching and learning. Since the early 1980s, many school systems have granted individual schools increasing authority to make autonomous decisions on curricula and resource allocation on the premise that individual schools are good judges of their students' learning needs and of the most effective use of resources. The rationale was to raise performance levels by encouraging responsiveness to student and school needs at the local level (Whitty, 1997; Carnoy, 2000; Clark; 2009; Machin and Vernoit, 2011). This has involved increasing the decision-making responsibility and accountability of principals and, in some cases, the management responsibilities of teachers or department heads. Yet school systems differ in the degree of autonomy granted to schools and in the domains for which autonomy is awarded to schools.

PISA 2012 asked school principals to report whether the teachers, the principal, the school's governing board, the regional or local education authorities or the national education authority had considerable responsibility for allocating resources to schools (appointing and dismissing teachers; determining teachers' starting salaries and salary raises; and formulating school budgets and allocating them within the school) and responsibility for the curriculum and instructional assessment within the school (establishing student-assessment policies; choosing textbooks; and determining which courses are offered and the content of those courses). This information was combined to create two composite indices: an index of school responsibility for resource allocation, and an index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment, such that both indices have an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate more autonomy for school principals and teachers. ${ }^{1}$

In most countries and economies, few individual schools have a major influence on teachers' salaries. On average across OECD countries, around $70 \%$ or more of students are in schools whose principals reported that only national and/or regional education authorities have considerable responsibility for establishing teachers' starting salaries and determining teachers' salary increases (Figure IV.4.2). In contrast, school principals and/or teachers have more responsibility for decisions related to selecting and hiring teachers, dismissing teachers, formulating the school budget, and deciding on budget allocations within the school. School autonomy, as measured by the index of school responsibility for resource allocation, is greatest in Macao-China, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, and the United Kingdom, as reported by school principals in these countries. In contrast, responsibility for resource allocation is least among schools in Turkey, Greece, Albania, Italy, Germany, Romania, Austria, France and Jordan (Table IV.4.1).

Schools within a country or an economy show varying degrees of autonomy in allocating resources. School principals in Turkey, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Romania and Belgium reported similar levels of autonomy in allocating resources, while in Peru, the Czech Republic, Chile, Indonesia, the United Arab Emirates, Macao-China, the Slovak Republic and the United Kingdom, some schools are permitted to allocate resources while for other schools these decisions are made by national or regional education authorities (Table IV.4.1). As expected, in virtually all participating countries and economies, private schools tend to have more autonomy in allocating resources than public schools. In 18 countries and economies, upper secondary schools tend to have more autonomy in allocating resources than lower secondary schools, while in Liechtenstein, Switzerland and Macao-China the reverse is true (Table IV.4.2).

In general, school systems that give responsibility for resource allocation to individual schools also tend to grant schools responsibility for curricular decisions, although this is not the case in some systems, such as Japan and Bulgaria. ${ }^{2}$ Relatively higher levels of school autonomy in setting curricula and assessment practices are observed in Japan, Thailand, the Netherlands, Hong Kong-China and the United Kingdom, as measured by the index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment. By contrast, Greece, Turkey, Jordan, Viet Nam, Qatar, Malaysia, Mexico, Serbia, Croatia, Luxembourg, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Uruguay are among those countries that grant the least responsibility to schools in making decisions about curricula and assessments (Figure IV.4.3 and Table IV.4.3).

Not all schools within the same system have the same level of discretion over their curricula and assessments. For example, in the United Arab Emirates, Peru, Tunisia and the Slovak Republic, some schools can formulate their own curricula and assessments while other schools must abide by decisions taken by the school governing board or national/regional authorities. The opposite is true in Serbia, Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, Luxembourg and Croatia, where
all schools have similar levels of autonomy in designing their curricula (Table IV.4.3). In some countries and economies, there is a difference in the degree of school autonomy in deciding curricula and assessments between upper and lower secondary schools, but the pattern is not consistent: upper secondary schools tend to have more autonomy in this area than lower secondary schools in 12 countries and economies, while the reverse is observed in five other countries. In 26 countries and economies, private schools tend to have higher degrees of autonomy in making decisions about curricula and assessments, but in Estonia, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, the reverse is observed (Table IV.4.2).

## Box IV.4.1. School autonomy and collaboration among schools

Greater school autonomy does not lead to less collaboration among schools and school leaders; on the contrary: collaboration can complement school autonomy to promote greater empowerment of schools, and horizontal networks can also support more innovation by schools.

Sometimes school leaders in schools that have been granted greater autonomy have not yet been trained in all the areas for which they are now responsible (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008). When school leaders lack sufficient expertise, the simplest types of co-operation, such as sharing managerial and administrative resources, can help reduce the school leaders' administrative workload and minimise inefficiencies. More important, more advanced types of collaboration, including collective learning, can help to develop leadership capacity (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008). Networks of schools help to overcome the isolation of individual schools and educators by providing opportunities for organised professional exchange, development and enrichment (Sliwka, 2003).

In England (United Kingdom), for example, the government has been supporting a variety of approaches to enhance co-operation among schools and school leaders since the early 2000s. Funding for school-innovation projects often required schools to partner together and apply as school clusters, rather than as individual schools. More recently, when schools were invited to assume greater autonomy by applying for "academy" status, the government also encouraged strong academies to work with weaker schools to raise standards. Several academies have joined a "chain", which acts as a common trust for all of them. School-led partnerships among independent academies have also developed, such as the "Challenge Partners" network, which uses peer inspection as a way of fostering continuous improvement.

In Scotland (United Kingdom), "Heads Together" is a nationwide online community used by school leaders to share experiences, policies and ideas. It was launched after a successful pilot phase in 2003, and has since become part of the national intranet for schools, "Glow".

In Shanghai (China), policies support collaboration between better- and lower-performing schools with the aim of transferring leadership capacity from the former to the latter. One aspect is called empowered administration, a school-custody programme in which the government asks higher-performing public schools to administer weaker schools. Under this scheme, the high-performing school appoints its experienced leader, such as the deputy principal, to be the principal of the weaker school and sends a team of experienced teachers to lead in teaching. In this way, the ethos, management style and teaching methods of the good schools are transferred to the poorer-performing school. In addition, a consortium of schools is established, where strong and weak schools, old and new, public and private, are grouped into a consortium or cluster, with one strong school at the core (OECD, 2011).

Authentic and fruitful collaboration among autonomous actors, however, cannot simply be decreed. A general lesson that emerges from the OECD project on "Improving School Leadership" (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008) is that if collaboration activities are perceived as being imposed from above rather than being pursued out of real commitment, their effectiveness will be limited.

[^9]
## School autonomy over resource allocation

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that only "principals and/or teachers", only "regional and/or national education authority", or both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board" has/have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks:

| A | Sel |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | Fir |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | Est |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | De |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | For |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | De |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | On |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Bo |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | On |

Felecting teachers for hire
Firing teachers
Establishing teachers' starting salaries
Determining teachers' salaries increases
Formulating the school budget
Deciding on budget allocations within the school
Both "principals and/or teachers"
only "regipals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"


## School autonomy over curricula and assessments

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that only＂principals and／or teachers＂，only＂regional and／or national education authority＂，or both＂principals and／or teachers＂and＂regional and／or national education authority＂，or＂school governing board＂has／have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks：

| A | E |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | C |
| C | D |

Establishing student assessment policies
Choosing which textbooks are used
Determining course content
Deciding which courses are offered
1 Only＂principals and／or teachers＂
Both＂principals and／or teachers＂and＂regional and／or national education authority＂，or＂school governing board＂
Only＂regional and／or national education authority＂


Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Table IV．4．3．
StatLink 部定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957346

Some caution is advised when interpreting the degree of responsibility schools have in allocating resources, formulating curricula and using student assessments. Decision-making arrangements vary widely across countries, so the questions posed to school principals were general; thus, responses may depend on how school principals interpreted the questions. For example, when school principals were asked who has considerable responsibility for formulating the school budget, some school principals might have related this question to the regular budget of the school, while others may not have had any involvement in the regular budget and may therefore have related the question to supplementary budgets, i.e. contributions from parents or the community.

## School choice

Chapter 1 shows that schools systems emphasising greater competition for students among schools and greater school choice, do not necessarily perform better than systems with less competition among schools. This result reflects the fact that school competition is a multi-faceted concept, as described, in detail, below.

Students in some school systems are assigned to attend their neighbourhood school (see Chapter 2 for more details). However, in recent decades, reforms in many countries have tended to give greater choice to parents and students, to enable them to choose the schools that meet their children's educational needs or preferences (Heyneman, 2009). On the premise that students and parents have adequate information and choose schools based on academic criteria or programme quality, the competition for schools creates incentives for institutions to organise programmes and teaching in ways that better meet diverse student requirements and interests, thus reducing the cost of failure and mismatches. In some school systems this competition has financial stakes for schools such that schools not only compete for enrolment, but also for funding. Direct public funding of independently managed institutions, based on student enrolments or student credit-hours, is one model for this. Giving money to students and their families (through, for example, scholarships or vouchers) to spend on public or private educational institutions of their choice is another method. But some studies have questioned the validity of the underlying assumptions about parental and student choice (Schneider et al., 2002; Hess and Loveless, 2005; Berends and Zottola, 2009; Jensen et al., 2013); and, in some cases, adopting school-choice practices has led to greater socio-economic and academic segregation among schools. ${ }^{3}$ In some school systems, more responsibility for regulating enrolment has been given to the education authority (Box IV.4.2).

## Box IV.4.2. Improving equity in Belgium's (French community) enrolment system

The French community of Belgium, which offers parents and students a high degree of school choice, recently adopted a scheme to regulate enrolments in the first year of secondary education. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ This was done to ensure that all families have equal access to the lower secondary school of their choice, to prevent dropout, and to maintain a good social, cultural and academic mix of students in every school.
Through the scheme, parents are given a pre-printed form on which they indicate their preferred school and any other choice of schools, in order of preference. Parents are also asked to report on the proximity of their home to the primary school their child attended, the proximity of their home to their preferred secondary school, the proximity of the preferred secondary school to the primary school the child attended, and other schools located in the municipality of their child's primary school. Parents are also asked whether the child aims to continue immersion learning begun in primary school and whether there is a partnership between the primary and preferred secondary schools. Each child is then given a ranking based on a composite index of these criteria.

If the number of applications received by the preferred lower secondary school does not exceed the number of places available, all enrolment applications are accepted. In all other cases, the school ranks the applications on the basis of objective, weighted geographical and educational criteria, and awards $80 \%$ of the places in accordance with the ranking, while ensuring that the remaining places are awarded to pupils from disadvantaged primary schools.
An Inter-Network Enrolment Commission manages the cases of those students who could not be enrolled in their first-choice school. These students are allocated places in the schools where there are still some available or are allocated one of the reserved places in the schools that are already $80 \%$ "full".
After this process is completed, enrolments may be resumed on a first-come, first-served basis. For more information, see the Eurypedia section on Belgium (French community)'s organisation of general lower secondary education.

[^10]On average across OECD countries, $41 \%$ of students are in schools where residence in a particular area is always considered for admission, while $59 \%$ are in schools where residence in a particular area is never or sometimes considered for admission to school. In fact, in 27 countries and economies, $70 \%$ or more students are in schools where residence in a particular area is never or sometimes considered for admission to school. Over $90 \%$ of students in Belgium, Serbia, Slovenia, Macao-China, Peru, Croatia, Montenegro, Singapore, Mexico, Japan and Romania attend such schools. By contrast, in Poland, the United States, Greece and Canada, $30 \%$ of students or fewer attend such schools (Table IV.4.6).

Naturally, school systems in which more schools use admissions criteria other than the school catchment area tend to have more competition among schools. On average across OECD countries, $24 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that there are no other schools in the areas that compete for students; $16 \%$ are in schools that compete with one other school; and $61 \%$ are in schools that compete with two or more other schools. Fewer than $50 \%$ of students in Norway, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Montenegro, Finland and Iceland are in schools that compete with at least one other school for students, while over 90\% of students in Singapore, Hong Kong-China, Indonesia, Macao-China, Chinese Taipei, Belgium, Australia, Latvia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Korea, the Netherlands, the United Arab Emirates and Japan attend such schools (Table IV.4.4).

School competition is more common at the upper secondary level of education, where there is generally greater differentiation of education programmes than at lower levels of education. For example, in Viet Nam, 38\% of lower secondary students attend schools that compete with at least one other school, while $83 \%$ of upper secondary students attend such schools - a 45 percentage-point difference. In Bulgaria, Sweden, the Slovak Republic, Greece and the Czech Republic, the difference between the two groups is between 21 and 39 percentage points. In contrast, in a few school systems, there is more competition at the lower secondary than at the upper secondary level. For example, in Austria, $80 \%$ of lower secondary students attend schools that compete for students with at least one other school, while $59 \%$ of upper secondary students attend such schools (Table IV.4.5).

However, as Figure IV.4.4 shows, even when admission to schools is not based on catchment area, individual schools are not always competing with other schools for enrolment. Some schools use residential area as the criterion for selecting students, but there may be several schools within the area, such that schools still have to compete for enrolment with other schools. In contrast, not all schools that do not use the school catchment area as a criterion for admission compete with other schools for enrolment: there may, for example, be no other school in the area. Even if there are other schools in the same area, if these schools have different levels of academic achievement, different instructional or religious philosophies, or offer different programmes, school principals may not perceive that there are schools in the same area competing for enrolment. In Finland, Japan, Canada, Belgium, Qatar, Mexico and Singapore, schools that always consider residence in a particular area for admission to school are more likely to compete with other schools for enrolment than schools that never or sometimes use residence as a criterion for admission (the percentage-point difference in the prevalence of school competition between the two groups is between 0.7 and 16.4). In contrast, in Luxembourg, Peru, Montenegro, Shanghai-China, Ireland, Iceland and the United Kingdom, schools that never or sometimes consider residence in a particular area for admission to school are more likely to compete with other schools for enrolment than schools that always consider residence as a criterion for admission. The difference in the prevalence of school competition between the two groups is between 7.8 and 28.6 percentage points (Table IV.4.6).

Principals' perceptions of school competition are not necessarily the same as those of the parents of students in their schools. In 11 countries and economies, PISA asked parents of students who participated in PISA 2012 to report whether there are one or more other schools in the same area that compete with the school their child attends. ${ }^{4}$ As expected, in all of these countries and economies, parents in schools whose principals reported that the school competes with other schools for students were more likely to report that there is at least one other school competing with the school their child attends, than parents in schools whose principals reported that the school does not compete with any other school. However, even among parents whose children attend schools that compete with one or more other schools, according to principals, the parents of between $20 \%$ and $45 \%$ of these students reported that no other school competes for enrolment with their child's school. There are various reasons for this discrepancy. For example, these parents might not have enough information about other schools in the area. Even if they are aware that there are other schools in the vicinity, those schools may already be full, parents might think that those schools are too far, the schools' level of academic achievement does not meet the parents' standards, or school fees are too high, so that parents do not consider these schools as competitors with their children's school (Table IV.4.9).

## School competition and school policy on catchment area

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that one or more schools compete for students in the area, according to whether:
$\square \square$ Residence in particular area is "never" or "sometimes" considered for admission to school
$\diamond$ Residence in particular area is "always" considered for admission to school


Note: White symbols represent differences that are not statistically significant
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the difference in the percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that one or more schools compete for students in the area between schools where residence in a particular area is "never" or "sometimes" considered, and schools where residence in a particular area is "always" considered for admission to school (never/sometimes - always).
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.6.
StatLink 唡而t http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Figure IV.4.5 [Part 1/2]
Parents' reports on criteria used to choose schools for their child, by students' socio-economic status
Percentage of parents who reported that the following criteria are very important in choosing a school for their child
All parents
All parents
$\triangle \triangle$ Parents at the top quarter of ESCS
$\square \square$ Parents at the bottom quarter of ESCS







[^11]Figure IV.4.5 [Part 2/2]
Parents' reports on criteria used to choose schools for their child, by students' socio-economic status
Percentage of parents who reported that the following criteria are very important in choosing a school for their child


[^12]These results show that school competition is a multi-faceted concept, affected by such factors as local school markets, school performance, affordability, capacity and enrolment patterns. Often, a single indicator does not adequately capture the extent of school competition and the degree to which parents choose schools with better performance through school competition. To understand differences in how parents choose schools for their children, parents in the 11 countries that distributed the parent questionnaire were asked a series of questions regarding school choice. As shown in Figure IV.4.5, in nine of these countries and economies, over $50 \%$ of parents reported that a safe school environment is a very important criterion when choosing a school for their child. In four countries and economies, over $50 \%$ of parents reported that a school's good reputation is a very important criterion for choosing a school for their child. It is noteworthy that parents do not rate "high academic achievement of students in the school" as important as these two criteria. In Korea, $50 \%$ of parents reported high academic achievement of students as a very important criterion for choosing a school for their child, while in Belgium (Flemish community), Hungary, Italy, Germany, Hong Kong-China, Croatia and Macao-China, between $15 \%$ and $31 \%$ of parents reported so (Figure IV.4.5 and Table IV.4.10).

The criteria parents use to choose a school for their child not only vary across countries and economies, but also within countries and economies. In all countries and economies with data from parents, socio-economically disadvantaged parents are more likely than advantaged parents to report that they considered "low expenses" and "financial aid" to be very important criteria in choosing a school. As show in Figure IV.4.5, in Chile, 39\% of disadvantaged parents reported that "low expenses" is a very important criterion in choosing a school, while $14 \%$ of advantaged parents reported so. In Portugal, $31 \%$ of disadvantaged parents reported that "financial aid" is a very important criterion in choosing a school, while $10 \%$ of advantaged parents reported so. In contrast, advantaged parents are more likely than disadvantaged parents to cite academic achievement as a "very important" consideration when choosing a school for their children. The greatest difference is observed in Korea, with a 21 percentage-point difference between disadvantaged parents (39\%) who reported that they consider academic achievement to be very important in choosing a school, and advantaged parents ( $60 \%$ ) who reported so. In Mexico, Portugal, Hungary, Belgium (Flemish community), Croatia, Chile, Hong Kong-China, Macao-China and Italy, the difference between the two groups is between 3 and 20 percentage points. The opposite is observed only in Germany, where $31 \%$ of disadvantaged parents reported that they consider academic achievement to be a very important criterion in choosing a school, while $21 \%$ of advantaged parents reported so (Figure IV.4.5 and Table IV.4.11).

These differences suggest that socio-economically disadvantaged parents believe that they have more limited choices of schools for their children because of financial constraints. If children from disadvantaged status cannot attend highperforming schools for this reason, then even school systems that offer parents more school choice for their children will be less effective in improving the performance of all students.

## Public and private involvement

Schooling mainly takes places in public institutions, defined by PISA as schools managed directly or indirectly by a public education authority, government agency, or governing board appointed by government or elected by public franchise. Nevertheless, with an increasing variety of education opportunities, programmes and providers, governments are forging new partnerships to mobilise resources for education and to design new policies that allow the different stakeholders to participate more fully and to share costs and benefits more equitably. Private education is not only a way of mobilising resources from a wider range of funding sources; it is sometimes also regarded as a way of making education more costeffective. Publicly financed schools are not necessarily also publicly managed. Instead, governments can transfer funds to public and private educational institutions according to various allocation mechanisms.

On average across OECD countries, $82 \%$ of 15 -year-old students attend public schools, while $14 \%$ of students attend government-dependent private schools, which are managed directly or indirectly by a non-government organisation and receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the institution's basic educational services) from government agencies. Some $4 \%$ of students attend government-independent private schools, which are managed directly or indirectly by a non-government organisation and receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding from government agencies. In Turkey, Israel, Montenegro, Serbia, Iceland, Tunisia, Romania, the Russian Federation, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Norway and Croatia, over $98 \%$ of students attend public schools. By contrast, in Macao-China, Hong Kong-China, the Netherlands, Chile and Ireland, fewer than one in two 15 -year-old students attends public schools. In Hong Kong-China and Macao-China, over $80 \%$ of 15 -year-old students attend government-dependent private schools (Table IV.4.7).

In 37 participating countries and economies, students who attend private schools (either government-dependent or government-independent schools) are more socio-economically advantaged than those who attend public schools. The difference between public and private schools in the average socio-economic status of their students is particularly large
in Uruguay, Costa Rica, Mexico, Brazil, Peru and Poland. Only in Chinese Taipei is the average socio-economic status of students who attend public schools more advantaged than that of those who attend private schools. Some $32 \%$ of students in Chinese Taipei attend private schools (Table IV.4.7).

## Management and leadership by principals

Chapter 1 shows that the relationship between school autonomy and performance in mathematics varies according to the degree to which principals collaborate with teachers throughout the system. In systems where teachers and principals collaborate more frequently in managing schools, autonomy is positively related to performance in mathematics.

School principals can shape teachers' professional development, define the school's educational goals, ensure that instructional practice is directed towards achieving these goals, suggest modifications to improve teaching practices, and help solve problems that may arise within the classroom or among teachers. Principals are not only administrators, they can also become instructional leaders who motivate teachers to improve the quality of their practice and provide a framework for effective teacher collaboration (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Bossert et al., 1981; Blase and Blase, 1998; Hallinger and Heck, 1998; and Wiseman, 2004). An international comparative study shows that effective principals are likely to display both administrate and instructional leadership (OECD, 2009).

PISA 2012 asked school principals to report how frequently various actions and behaviours related to managing their school, including teacher participation in school management, occurred in the previous academic year (Figure IV.4.6 and Table IV.4.8).

- On average across OECD countries, $72 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that the school gives staff opportunities to make decisions concerning the school at least once a month ( $54 \%$ are in schools that give these opportunities from once a month to once a week; and $18 \%$ are in schools that give these opportunities more than once a week). Over $80 \%$ of students in Canada, Sweden, the United States, Finland, Portugal, Iceland, Australia, Jordan, Brazil, Norway, New Zealand, Colombia (Box IV.4.3), Chile, Denmark, Turkey, Germany and Thailand attend schools that give staff these opportunities at least once a month; while in Shanghai-China, Macao-China, Liechtenstein, Poland, France, Romania and Luxembourg, fewer than $50 \%$ of students attend such schools.
- Across OECD countries, an average of $70 \%$ of students are in schools whose principal reported that teachers are involved at least once a month in building a culture of continuous improvement in the school ( $47 \%$ of students are in schools where this occurs once a month to once a week; and $23 \%$ are in schools where this occurs more than once a week). Over $80 \%$ of students in Liechtenstein, the United States, Chile, Turkey, Australia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, Malaysia, Uruguay, Germany, Singapore, Slovenia, Brazil, Indonesia, Thailand, Canada, Denmark, Sweden, Latvia, Jordan, Portugal and New Zealand attend schools where teachers are involved in this activity at least once a month; while in Luxembourg, France, Macao-China, Shanghai-China, Japan and Romania, fewer than 50\% of students attend such schools.
- On average across OECD countries, $29 \%$ of students are in schools whose principal reported that teachers are asked to review management practices at least once a month ( $24 \%$ are in schools where teachers do so once a month to once a week; and $6 \%$ are in schools where teachers do so more than once a week). Over $50 \%$ of students in Turkey, Thailand, Malaysia, Jordan, Albania, Indonesia, Bulgaria, Uruguay, Brazil, Kazakhstan, the United States, the United Arab Emirates, Korea, Australia, Montenegro and the United Kingdom attend schools where teachers participate in this activity at least once a month; while in Luxembourg, France, Hungary, Switzerland and Shanghai-China, around 10\% of students or fewer attend such schools.

Principals' responses to these questions are combined to develop a composite index, the index of school management: teacher participation (Figure IV.4.6 and Table IV.4.12). This index has an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate greater teacher participation. In Turkey, Brazil, Jordan and Malaysia, principals reported that teachers are involved in managing school a greater extent, while principals in Shanghai-China, France and Romania reported that teachers are involved in this activity to a lesser extent (Figure IV.4.6 and Table IV.4.12).

Principals were also asked about their own management style. Responses to these questions are combined to develop three composite indices: an index on framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development; an index on instructional leadership; and an index on promoting instructional improvements and professional development. Each of these indices has an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate greater principals' leadership in each area (see Tables IV.4.13, IV.4.14 and IV.4.15, available on line).

Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that he/she engaged in the following actions "more than once a week", "once a month to once a week", "3-4 times during the year" or "never or 1-2 times during the year"


Engage teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school
Ask teachers to participate in reviewing management practices
1 Never or 1-2 times during the year

| 2 |
| :--- |
| 4 |

Once a month to once a week
More than once a week


Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the average index
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.4.8 and IV.4.12.
StatLink 房int http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Principals in Brazil, Kazakhstan, Qatar, Malaysia, the United Kingdom, the United States and the United Arab Emirates reported that they are more frequently involved in framing and communicating the school's goals and in curricular development than other countries and economies, while principals in Japan, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Romania, Tunisia and Poland reported that they are involved in these less (Table IV.4.13). Principals in Qatar, the United States, Jordan, Brazil, Malaysia, Turkey, Australia and the United Kingdom tended to report they practice greater instructional leadership, while principals in Japan, Liechtenstein, France, Tunisia and Switzerland reported to practice this less than principals in other countries and economies (Table IV.4.14). In some countries, such as Brazil, Montenegro, Jordan, Turkey and Albania, principals also promote instructional improvements and professional development, while principals in Romania, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands and Japan reported that they are less active in this regard than principals in other countries and economies (Table IV.4.15).

In general, schools whose principals reported that they show leadership in framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development also tend to be those whose principals reported showing leadership in instruction. The correlation between the index of school management: framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development and the index of school management: instructional leadership is 0.67 on average across OECD countries, ranging from around 0.51 to 0.54 in Uruguay, Shanghai-China, Switzerland, Albania and Poland, to around 0.80 or more in Romania, Thailand, Costa Rica and Korea. Schools whose principals reported that they show leadership in instruction also tend to welcome teachers' participation in school management. On average across OECD countries, the index of school management: instructional leadership and the index of school management: teacher participation is 0.60 , ranging from 0.37 in Luxembourg to over 0.80 in Romania, Montenegro, Liechtenstein and Thailand (Table IV.4.16).

These relationships at the school level are also mirrored at the system level. School systems in which principals are more frequently engaged in framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development tend to be systems in which principals reported that they provide instructional leadership (correlation coefficient is 0.84 across OECD countries, and 0.87 across all participating countries and economies). In addition, systems with higher level of principals' instructional leadership tend to have more teachers participating in managing school (correlation coefficient is 0.78 across OECD countries, and 0.74 across all participating countries and economies) (Tables IV.4.12, IV.4.13 and IV.4.14).

## Parental involvement

Parents are often expected to be partners with teachers and principals in order to better meet the learning objectives of their children (Gunnarsson et al., 2009; Zhao and Akiba, 2009). This partnership can take the form of: parents discussing educational matters with their children; parents supervising their children's progress through education; parents communicating with the school; and parents actively participating in school activities. While the first two forms of parental involvement involve interactions between parents and their children, the latter two involve interactions between parents and the school (Ho and Willms, 1996).

PISA 2012 asked principals to define the proportion of students' parents who participated in various school-related activities. Parents' discussing their child's progress on the initiative of one of their child's teachers seems to be one of the most common forms of parental involvement in school. As shown in Figure IV.4.7, across OECD countries, the average student attends schools whose principal reported that $47 \%$ of parents discussed their child's progress on the initiative of one of their child's teachers; $38 \%$ of parents discussed their child's behaviour on the initiative of one of their child's teachers; $27 \%$ of parents discussed their child's progress with a teacher on their own initiative; $23 \%$ of parents discussed their child's behaviour with a teacher on their own initiative; $11 \%$ of parents participated in local school government; $10 \%$ of parents assisted in fundraising for the school; $8 \%$ of parents volunteered in extracurricular activities, such as a book club, school play, sporting event or field trip; $5 \%$ of parents assisted a teacher in the school; $4 \%$ of parents volunteered in physical activities at school, such as building maintenance, carpentry, gardening or yard work; $2 \%$ of parents volunteered in the school library or media centre; $2 \%$ of parents appeared as a guest speaker; and $1 \%$ of parents volunteered in the school canteen. In Norway, Sweden, Macao-China, Denmark and Japan, the average student attends a school whose principal reported that around $70 \%$ of parents or more discussed their child's progress at the initiative of one of their child's teachers. By contrast, the average student in Tunisia, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, Croatia, Uruguay, Ireland and Austria attends a school whose principal reported that fewer than $30 \%$ of parents did so (Figure IV.4.7 and Table IV.4.17).

- Figure IV.4.7 $\quad$.

Parental involvement
Based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students' parents who participated in the following school-related activities during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| O Australia | 19 | 30 | 26 | 41 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 4 |
| Austria | 17 | 22 | 26 | 29 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 8 | , |
| Belgium | 20 | 28 | 24 | 35 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Canada | 24 | 36 | 32 | 41 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 9 | , |
| Chile | 29 | 58 | 29 | 59 | 9 | 14 | 5 | 15 | 6 | 34 | 30 | 2 |
| Czech Republic | 18 | 31 | 24 | 40 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | a |
| Denmark | 17 | 41 | 20 | 74 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Estonia | 17 | 27 | 22 | 40 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Finland | 26 | 45 | 28 | 55 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 1 |
| France | 26 | 40 | 25 | 41 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Germany | 22 | 30 | 27 | 35 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Greece | 33 | 33 | 51 | 39 | 5 | 7 | 2 | a | 3 | 20 | 14 | 1 |
| Hungary | 17 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 0 |
| Iceland | 16 | 41 | 19 | 57 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 4 |
| Ireland | 11 | 24 | 15 | 28 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 1 |
| Israel | 24 | 41 | 28 | 49 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 0 |
| Italy | 43 | 46 | 48 | 47 | 1 | 9 | 2 | a | 2 | 36 | 11 | a |
| Japan | 10 | 63 | 11 | 70 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4 | a |
| Korea | 25 | 45 | 30 | 47 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| Luxembourg | 26 | 44 | 32 | 48 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Mexico | 28 | 45 | 29 | 48 | 18 | 17 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 34 | 25 | 5 |
| Netherlands | 17 | 31 | 27 | 43 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| New Zealand | 18 | 26 | 23 | 42 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 1 |
| Norway | 13 | 52 | 17 | 87 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 0 |
| Poland | 28 | 53 | 32 | 59 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 17 | 16 | a |
| Portugal | 35 | 47 | 38 | 53 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 0 |
| Slovak Republic | 26 | 32 | 19 | 23 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | , | 17 | 13 | 0 |
| Slovenia | 30 | 36 | 38 | 34 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 26 | 0 |
| Spain | 35 | 52 | 40 | 62 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 9 | 0 |
| Sweden | 15 | 36 | 27 | 80 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| Switzerland | 18 | 42 | 20 | 47 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | , | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Turkey | 32 | 41 | 30 | 36 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 22 | 11 | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 15 | 29 | 19 | 53 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| United States | 24 | 33 | 32 | 41 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 1 |
| OECD average | 23 | 38 | 27 | 47 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 1 |
| \% Albania | 42 | 58 | 45 | 58 | 10 | 19 | 9 | 14 | 18 | 48 | 19 | 5 |
| Argentina | 22 | 43 | 20 | 44 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 18 | 18 | 6 |
| Bre Brazil | 24 | 41 | 25 | 42 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 21 | 5 | 1 |
| Bulgaria | 30 | 48 | 30 | 44 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 0 |
| Colombia | 37 | 59 | 39 | 58 | 13 | 16 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 51 | 28 | 6 |
| Costa Rica | 26 | 40 | 31 | 40 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 21 | 22 | 3 |
| Croatia | 31 | 27 | 32 | 27 | 2 | 7 | 1 | a | 2 | 18 | 11 | a |
| Hong Kong-China | 38 | 66 | 39 | 66 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 31 | 49 | 32 | 43 | 21 | 21 | 12 | 18 | 11 | 53 | 23 | 6 |
| Jordan | 29 | 33 | 28 | 30 | 12 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 31 | 5 | 5 |
| Kazakhstan | 57 | 56 | 61 | 65 | 41 | 52 | 33 | 46 | 34 | 51 | 15 | 11 |
| Latvia | 26 | 35 | 33 | 42 | 9 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 1 |
| Liechtenstein | 11 | 42 | 11 | 57 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Lithuania | 32 | 38 | 36 | 44 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 0 |
| Macao-China | 31 | 80 | 34 | 76 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 25 | 0 |
| Malaysia | 17 | 25 | 16 | 31 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 19 | 32 | 3 |
| Montenegro | 49 | 43 | 39 | 38 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 22 | 2 | a |
| Peru | 33 | 41 | 33 | 44 | 16 | 16 | 5 | 18 | 5 | 48 | 30 | 3 |
| Qatar | 40 | 47 | 43 | 52 | 10 | 22 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 28 | 16 | 4 |
| Romania | 39 | 46 | 40 | 49 | 16 | 22 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 35 | 31 | 2 |
| Russian Federation | 28 | 39 | 39 | 49 | 31 | 32 | 5 | 26 | 18 | 27 | 27 | 8 |
| Serbia | 39 | 50 | 36 | 45 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 20 | 0 |
| Shanghai-China | 49 | 58 | 46 | 55 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 3 |
| Singapore | 20 | 49 | 24 | 66 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 0 |
| Chinese Taipei | 39 | 41 | 34 | 38 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 1 |
| Thailand | 38 | 53 | 40 | 56 | 13 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 18 | 51 | 7 |
| Tunisia | 19 | 33 | 15 | 18 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| United Arab Emirates | 35 | 38 | 39 | 42 | 12 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 25 | 9 | 4 |
| Uruguay | 10 | 23 | 18 | 27 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 0 |
| Viet Nam | 45 | 49 | 49 | 52 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 41 | 18 | 24 | 61 | 2 |

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.17.
StatLink 京ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Principals were also asked to report whether they receive：constant pressure from many parents who expect their school to set very high academic standards and to achieve them；pressure from a minority of parents to achieve higher academic standards；or whether such pressure from parents is largely absent．On average across OECD countries，21\％ of students are in schools whose principals reported that they are pressured by many parents； $46 \%$ are in schools that are pressured by a minority of parents；and $33 \%$ are in schools that are not pressured by parents．In Singapore，Ireland， New Zealand，Sweden，the United Kingdom，Qatar，Viet Nam，Thailand，the United States，the United Arab Emirates and Australia，at least one out of three students are in schools whose principals reported that they are pressured by many parents；in Singapore， $60 \%$ of students attend such schools．By contrast，fewer than $10 \%$ of students in Macao－China， Hong Kong－China，Finland，Latvia，Croatia，Germany，Uruguay，Turkey，Lithuania，Serbia，Austria，Spain，Argentina， Korea，Belgium，Kazakhstan，and Switzerland are in schools that are pressured by many parents to meet high academic standards（Table IV．4．18）．

All of parents＇involvement in school activities－such as volunteering in physical activities，in extracurricular activities， and in the school library or media centre，assisting a teacher in the school，appearing as a guest speaker，or assisting in fundraising for the school－are highly correlated with each other，both across OECD countries and across all participating countries and economies．This means that when parents are highly involved in one of these school activities they also tend to be highly involved in other school activities．However，across OECD countries，the level of parents＇involvement in school activities seems not to be related to the degree of their involvement in discussing their child＇s behaviour and／or progress with a teacher（Figure IV．4．8）．
－Figure IV．4．8－
Relationship among various aspects of parental involvement

## Correlation coefficients between two relevant indicators

Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 （i．e．a perfect negative linear association）to +1.00 （i．e．a perfect positive linear association）． When a correlation coefficient is 0 ，there is no linear relationship between two indicators．

|  |  | Percentage of students whose parents．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Across OECD countries <br> Across all participating countries and economies |  |  |  | 禺安 <br> 这芫 <br> $\stackrel{5}{\circ}$ <br> 훋 <br>  <br> ฐ <br>  <br> 훙 |  | 音 를흘흘 <br>  ． <br>  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Discussed their child＇s behaviour with a teacher on their own initiative |  | 0.34 | 0.86 | －0．14 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.48 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.68 | 0.30 | 0.02 |
|  | Discussed their child＇s behaviour on the initiative of one of their child＇s teachers | 0.51 |  | 0.14 | 0.68 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.28 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.44 | 0.12 | 0.15 |
| \| | Discussed their child＇s progress with a teacher on their own initiative | 0.90 | 0.39 |  | －0．11 | －0．05 | －0．03 | 0.30 | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.50 | 0.25 | －0．01 |
| 坒 | Discussed their child＇s progress on the initiative of one of their child＇s teachers | 0.10 | 0.73 | 0.15 |  | 0.10 | 0.24 | －0．14 | －0．11 | －0．05 | 0.01 | －0．11 | 0.10 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \frac{0}{3} \\ 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | Volunteered in physical activities， e．g．building maintenance，carpentry， gardening or yard work | 0.45 | 0.23 | 0.46 | 0.13 |  | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.63 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.59 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \\ \stackrel{3}{4} \\ \stackrel{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | Volunteered in extracurricular activities，e．g．book club，school play， sports，field trip | 0.49 | 0.26 | 0.51 | 0.22 | 0.91 |  | 0.49 | 0.75 | 0.54 | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.36 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 800 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | Volunteered in the school library or media centre | 0.61 | 0.30 | 0.58 | 0.12 | 0.81 | 0.82 |  | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 0.49 | 0.45 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \hline \end{gathered}\right.$ | Assisted a teacher in the school | 0.57 | 0.26 | 0.60 | 0.10 | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.80 |  | 0.76 | 0.74 | 0.53 | 0.40 |
|  | Appeared as a guest speaker | 0.59 | 0.30 | 0.61 | 0.16 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.85 |  | 0.61 | 0.38 | 0.35 |
|  | Participated in local school government，e．g．parent council or school management committee | 0.63 | 0.38 | 0.56 | 0.06 | 0.71 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 0.66 | 0.70 |  | 0.58 | 0.40 |
|  | Assisted in fundraising for the school | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.41 | 0.09 | 0.45 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  | 0.46 |
|  | Volunteered in the school canteen | 0.41 | 0.25 | 0.38 | 0.14 | 0.81 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.63 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.41 |  |
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## TRENDS IN GOVERNANCE OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS SINCE PISA 2003

In 2003, on average across OECD countries, $83 \%$ of students attended government or public schools, $14 \%$ attended government-depended private schools and $4 \%$ attended government-independent private schools. ${ }^{5}$ These percentages have remained stable since then. In both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 students enrolled in government or public schools had, on average, a lower socio-economic status than students attending private schools (by an order of around 0.4 points in the PISA index of economic social and cultural status). However, some countries and economies have seen an increase in enrolment in public schools (Figure IV.4.9), while in others there has been a shift towards private schools (Table IV.4.19). In Indonesia, Mexico, Spain and Finland, a larger proportion of 15-year-old students attended public schools in 2012 than did in 2003. In Indonesia there was a 21 percentage-point reduction in the share of students attending government-independent private schools, with a consequent 13 percentage-point increase in enrolment in government-dependent private schools and an 8 percentage-point increase in public school enrolments. In Mexico, Spain and Finland there was a four percentage-point increase in the share of students attending public schools. In Sweden, the share of students enrolled in public schools fell by ten percentage points, with a consequent greater share of students attending government-dependent private schools. A similar shift in enrolment towards government-dependent schools - an increase of six percentage points - was observed in Thailand, and, to a lesser degree, in Poland (Figure IV.4.9 and Table IV.4.19).

- Figure IV. 4.9 -

Change between 2003 and 2012 in public school enrolments
Percentage of students enrolled in public schools


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The percentage-point difference in the share of students attending public schools (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable data since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the share of students in public schools in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.19.


In PISA 2003, students enrolled in public schools came from more socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds than students enrolled in private schools, on average across OECD countries. ${ }^{6}$ That year, only in Luxembourg were students from more advantaged backgrounds more likely to attend public schools. This general trend continued in most countries and economies through 2012. The disparity between the socio-economic status of students who attend public schools and those who attend private schools became wider in Mexico, Austria and Uruguay between 2003 and 2012. It became apparent in Denmark, while in 2003 there was no difference between the average socio-economic status of the two groups of students. In Luxembourg in 2012, students in public schools had the same average socio-economic status as those in private schools, in contrast to what was observed in 2003 (Table IV.4.19).

Only in Korea were public schools able to attract more advantaged students in 2012 than they did in 2003. While in 2003 the average student in public schools came from a substantially lower socio-economic background than students in private schools (a difference of 0.4 points in the PISA index of social, economic and cultural status), by 2012 there was no difference in the socio-economic status of the average student in public and private schools. It seems that between 2003 and 2012 public or government schools became better equipped to attract more advantaged students into their classrooms (Table IV.4.19). In addition, in Ireland and Brazil the socio-economic difference in students attending public and private schools narrowed between 2003 and $2012 .{ }^{7}$

## Box IV.4.3. Improving in PISA: Colombia

With a population of 47 million, Colombia is Latin America's third most populated country after Brazil and Mexico. It began participating in PISA in 2006 and has shown an average annual improvement in reading performance of 3.0 points per year (from 385 points in 2006 to 403 points in 2012). Improvement in reading was led by the country's lowest-achieving students: those in the 10th percentile of reading performance increased their scores by more than 50 points, from 243 to 295 points, in six years. Similarly, science performance among low-achieving students has increased while that of high-achieving students has remained stable. These large improvements follow those observed in the years prior to Colombia's first participation in PISA, as Colombia was the most rapid improver in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) between 1995 and 2007 (World Bank, 2010). These improvements are remarkable given the fact that, during the same period, Colombia has also increased its enrolment rates. Between 2002 and 2010, enrolment among 15-and 16-year-olds grew from $57 \%$ to $75 \%$, there was a $40 \%$ reduction in the share of students aged 5 to 14 who were not in education, and $98.5 \%$ of primary school pupils progressed into secondary school (up from $89.6 \%$ in 2000).

Since the mid-1990s, Colombia has been engaged in improving both access to and the quality of schooling. Cash-transfer programmes, such as Familias en Acción, public campaigns (Ni Uno Menos) and direct investment (Programa de Ampliación de la Cobertura y Mejoramiento de la Calidad de la Educación Secundaria, PACES) increased student enrolments and reduced dropout rates, while targeted programmes, such as Hogares Comunitarios de Bienestar Familiar and Grado Cero, promoted enrolment in early childhood programmes which, in turn, reduced the incidence of grade repetition. The Escuela Nueva and similar programmes have improved student achievement in rural areas by allowing students to progress through a flexible curriculum and engaging students through active pedagogy, democratic decision-making, and community engagement (World Bank, 2010).

More recently, the Todos a Aprender programme, which began in 2012, adopts a comprehensive view towards school change, offering support to low-performing schools on several fronts. It first makes sure students can go to and stay in school by offering transportation and meals to disadvantaged students. It offers new pedagogical material for teachers, training for teachers to develop their classroom management and pedagogical skills with the assistance of tutors, and support in developing school-improvement plans.

The early 2000s also mark the beginning of Revolución Educativa, a major education-improvement programme that modified how education policy objectives are set, the way resources are allocated, how education is monitored, how the central government supports schools and local authorities (Secretarías), and teachers' career trajectories. The programme scaled-up the policies and practices adopted in the local government of Bogotá since 1995, particularly between 1998 and 2003 (MEN, 2010).

The Revolución Educativa established quinquennial (Plan Sectorial) and decennial (Plan Decenal) educationdevelopment plans, articulating policy objectives and areas of development. These plans, developed centrally by the Ministry of Education in consultation with stakeholders and adapted locally by the Secretarías, provided a framework for the development of individual policies and programmes. They shifted the objective of education to student-centred instruction, focusing on competencies and clearly defining the quality benchmarks that ought to be achieved as students progress through school. The plan also called for an integrated information system to promote the development and follow-up of school-improvement plans (MEN, 2010).

A major shift in school financing also occurred in the early 2000s. Between 2002 and 2010, total funding for education increased by $48.4 \%, 60 \%$ of which was an increase in public expenditure. More important, the structure of school financing shifted, such that, as of the 2000s, central government funding is allocated to Secretarías and then to schools based on enrolments, accounting for the accessibility of each school. A per-pupil financing system required an up-to-date online information system with which all students could be identified and followed through the school system, but no such system existed in Colombia. Information systems were developed to follow students as they are promoted and transition to other levels, as they transfer to other schools, drop out or graduate (Sistema Integrado de Matrícula), track schools, their staff and performance results (Sistema Nacional de Información de Educación Básica), track human resources to co-ordinate pay and human-resource management (Sistema Integrado de Recursos Humanos), track financial resources to help Secretarías manage their schools and budget (Sistema de Gestión Financiera), and support school-improvement plans and follow the management of schools. These information systems were created to be compatible with national and local social and welfare information systems (MEN, 2010).

The devolution of school management to local education authorities required support from the central government to ensure that each authority was able to assume their responsibilities. Secretarías were thus assisted in evaluating their processes and were provided the infrastructure necessary for adequate education and information management. In many authorities, plans were developed to ensure a stable workforce to give continuity to each management area. Large investments, with co-operation from the Inter-Amercian Development Bank, were made to train workers and promote a work culture of efficiency and countinuous improvement. The Ministry of Education was also restructured (MEN, 2010).

The monitoring of students and schools for management and school-improvement purposes is central to these reforms. Quality benchmarks and the competencies to be acquired by students at different levels of education were defined, and the annual national exam for entry into tertiary education (ICFES) and the triennial national assessments (SABER) were integrated in a common framework in accordance with these standards. Colombia also participates regularly in international assessments. All of these assessments and examinations are now co-ordinated by an independent institution, the Instituto Colombiano de Evaluación de la Educación (MEN, 2010).

The Ministry of Education provides guidelines so that every school develops an improvement plan and each Secretaría offers support for schools to achieve these objectives. Improvement plans focus on leadership, instructional management, financial and administrative management, and the relationship with the community. The Ministry worked closely with the Secretarías to ensure that each local authority had the capacity to support their individual schools, and encouraged collaboration with non-profit foundations, universities and foreign governments to support local authorities and individual schools in their improvement plans. Annual forums are held where good practices at the school, local authority and international levels are shared (MEN, 2010).

These reforms also changed the way teachers are selected into and progress through the profession. As of 2002, all new teachers are required to hold university-level degrees, and are recruited through an open and competitive selection process that includes an assessment of course content and pedagogy, a psychological evaluation, a personal interview and consideration of prior experience. The results of these processes are also used to determine in which schools to place teachers. By 2010, $22 \%$ of working teachers had been selected through this process. Career advancement shifted from a tenure-based system to one based on competencies, identified through a new teacher-evaluation system. Teacher salaries were raised to be aligned with those of other social science professionals. Salary increases were concentrated at the beginning of a teacher's career, to encourage continual improvement and promote retention. In parallel, teacher pre-service training programmes were accredited and a pilot programme to improve them began in 2009 (MEN, 2010).
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## ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Chapter 1 shows that equity in a school system is positively related to the degree to which systems seek feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources, and to the degree to which teachers are mentored. Chapter 1 also shows that accountability arrangements, such as posting achievement data publicly and implementing standardised policies for mathematics, play an important role in relation to school autonomy and performance.

The shift in public and government concern away from mere control over the resources and content of education towards a focus on outcomes has, in many countries, led to the establishment of standards of quality for educational institutions. In most OECD countries, evaluation and assessment systems not only focus on students, but also on teachers and school leaders; and the use of performance data to improve teaching and learning has expanded in recent years (OECD, 2013a). The approaches to standard-setting that countries pursue range from defining broad education goals to formulating precise performance expectations in well-defined subject areas. PISA 2012 collected data on the nature of accountability systems and the ways in which the resulting information was used and made available to various stakeholders and the general public.

## Assessments and examinations

Countries and economies implement different policies to evaluate their students' performance. System-wide evaluations can generally be classified as those that do not have direct consequences for students (assessments) and those that do (examinations). Assessments can be used to take stock of students' performance in order to make decisions on future instruction or to summarise performance for information purposes. Although assessments can be used to, for example, decide on allocation of resources to low-performing schools or tailor instruction to low-performing students, assessment results do not have direct tangible consequences for students. Results from examinations, by contrast, can be used to determine students' progression to higher levels of education (e.g. the transition from lower to upper secondary school), selection into different curricular programmes (e.g. into vocational or academic programmes), or selection into university programmes. Assessments and examinations provide students with benchmarks, and, in the case of examinations, with incentives to work hard in school in order to pass the examinations.

All PISA-participating countries and economies have an assessment or examination system in place. ${ }^{8}$ Nineteen schools systems in OECD countries implement national assessments in all programmes in lower secondary schools and eight do so in upper secondary schools. Of these, in Belgium (Flemish community), Chile, Hungary, Korea, Mexico, Sweden and the United States national assessments are conducted in both lower and upper secondary schools (Tables IV.4.20 and IV.4.21). Twelve systems in OECD countries administer examinations in lower secondary schools and 21 systems in OECD countries conduct examinations in upper secondary schools. In some of these systems, however, not all students take these examinations, as they are only for students in general programmes (e.g. in lower secondary schools in Estonia, Germany and Portugal, and in upper secondary schools in Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Portugal) or for students in pre-vocational or vocational programmes (e.g. in upper secondary schools in Spain) (Tables IV.4.22 and IV.4.23). Other examinations are used in Belgium (French Community), Japan, Norway, Switzerland and the United States (Table IV.4.24 and Table IV.4.25). Examinations not conducted by secondary schools are required for access to tertiary education programmes in all OECD countries for at least some fields of study, except in Iceland, the Netherlands and Portugal, where no examination is required. These tertiary-level entrance examinations are required for access to all fields of study in Chile, Greece, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Sweden and Turkey. In Chile, Italy, Japan and Turkey they are the only way to gain access to tertiary education programmes. In 13 OECD countries these tertiary entrance examinations are used to determine access to selective institutions (Table IV.4.26).

Countries and economies can be grouped into four categories of assessment-and-examination systems as shown in Figure IV.4.10. A first group of countries and economies tends to have assessments at the lower secondary level and national examinations at the upper secondary level, with few tertiary fields of study requiring a special examination for admission. A second group of countries and economies tends to have national examinations at both the upper and secondary levels. A third group of countries and economies tends to rely on not only national examinations, but also other types of examinations or on other types of examinations only. The fourth group of countries and economies tends to have no examinations at the lower or upper secondary level, but a large number of tertiary fields of study require examinations. ${ }^{9}$

Twelve school systems in OECD countries conduct national examinations in lower secondary school and 21 do so in upper secondary school; all partner countries and economies conduct them in upper secondary school. At the lower secondary level, these examinations are, in all cases, used to certify students' graduation or grade completion.

## - Figure IV.4.10 - <br> Profiles of assessments and examinations across countries and economies

| Assessment in lower secondary, national exams in upper secondary, few fields requiring tertiary exams | Only national exams in lower and upper secondary | National or other non-national examinations in lower or upper secondary | No national or other examinations, most fields requiring tertiary exams |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Australia <br> Croatia <br> Czech Republic <br> England (UK) <br> Finland <br> Hong Kong-China <br> Hungary <br> Israel <br> Luxembourg <br> Scotland (UK) <br> Singapore <br> Slovak Republic <br> Tunisia | Albania <br> Bulgaria <br> Denmark <br> Estonia <br> France <br> Germany <br> Indonesia <br> Ireland <br> Italy <br> Jordan <br> Latvia <br> Lithuania <br> Malaysia <br> Netherlands <br> Poland <br> Portugal <br> Romania <br> Russian Federation <br> Shanghai-China <br> Chinese Taipei <br> Thailand <br> Viet Nam | Belgium (Fr. Comm.) <br> Liechtenstein <br> Montenegro <br> Norway <br> Qatar <br> United Arab Emirates <br> United States | Austria <br> Belgium (FI. Comm.) <br> Brazil <br> Chile <br> Colombia <br> Greece <br> Iceland <br> Japan <br> Korea <br> Macao-China <br> Mexico <br> Peru <br> Spain <br> Sweden <br> Turkey <br> Uruguay |

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.4.20, IV.4.21, IV.4.22, IV.4.23, IV.4.24, IV.4.25 and IV.4.26.

In Norway and Poland these examinations are used to determine access to selective upper secondary schools; and in Scotland, Norway and Ireland they are used to select students into certain programmes, courses or tracks in upper secondary school. In all OECD countries, the results from these examinations are shared directly with students, with an external audience in addition to education authorities, with school administrators (except in Italy), and directly with parents (except in Germany). Upper secondary examinations are also used in all OECD countries (except in general programmes in Poland) to certify completion or graduation and to determine students' access to tertiary education (except examinations in the United States and in pre-vocational and vocational programmes in Hungary and Spain). In 15 OECD countries these upper secondary examinations are also used to determine student selection for fields of study at the tertiary level (Tables IV.4.22 and IV.4.23)

## Assessment practices and purposes

Principals were asked to report on how student assessments are used. Among the possibilities offered, assessments are most commonly used in OECD countries to inform parents about their child's progress: $98 \%$ of students, on average, are in schools whose principal reported that student assessments are used in this way. Some $81 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that student assessments are used to monitor the school's progress from year to year; $80 \%$ are in schools that use student assessments to identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved; $77 \%$ are in schools that use them to make decisions about whether students are held back or promoted; $63 \%$ are in schools that use them to compare the school to district or national performance; and about one in two students attends a school that uses student assessments to compare the school with other schools, to group students for instructional purposes, or to make judgements about teachers' effectiveness (Figure IV.4.11 and Table IV.4.30).

Systems in which more schools use student assessments for one purpose also tend to be systems where more schools use them for other purposes as well. The strongest relationship among the different uses of student assessment among the OECD countries is found between the proportion of students who attend schools whose principals reported that they use student assessments to compare the school to district or national performance and to compare the school to other schools (correlation coefficient is 0.85 ) (Figure IV.4.12). The only exception is "to make decisions about students' retention or promotion", which seems not to be related to any other assessment purposes; sometimes it has a negative relationship with other uses of student assessments. For example, across OECD countries, those where more schools use student assessments to make decisions about whether students are retained or promoted than in other countries tend to be less likely than other countries to use the assessments to compare the school's performance to district or national performance (Figure IV.4.12).

- Figure IV.4.11

Use of assessment practices


Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.30.
StatLink 可ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Using student assessments to make decisions about whether students are held back or promoted is prevalent in Greece, Portugal, Hong Kong-China, the Netherlands, Poland, Latvia, France, Belgium, Germany, Viet Nam, Tunisia, Kazakhstan and Canada (around $95 \%$ or more), while in Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden and Chinese Taipei, fewer than one in two students attends a school that uses student assessment for that purpose (Table IV.4.30).

Figure IV.4.12
Relationship among various aspects of assessment practices and purposes

## Correlation coefficients between two relevant indicators

Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 (i.e. a perfect negative linear association) to +1.00 (i.e. a perfect positive linear association). When a correlation coefficient is 0 , there is no linear relationship between two indicators.

|  | Across OECD countries <br> Across all participating countries and economies | To inform parents about their child's progress | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds are used for the following purposes: |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index <br> of assessment practices (sum of "yes" responses to these <br> eight purposes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | To make decisions about students' retention or promotion | To group students for instructional purposes | To compare the school to district or national performance | To monitor the school's progress from year to year | To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved | To compare the school with other schools |  |
|  | To inform parents about their child's progress |  | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.02 | 0.28 |
|  | To make decisions about students' retention or promotion | 0.02 |  | -0.19 | -0.34 | -0.17 | 0.03 | -0.21 | -0.40 | -0.07 |
|  | To group students for instructional purposes | 0.16 | -0.08 |  | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.45 | 0.69 |
|  | To compare the school to district or national performance | 0.10 | -0.18 | 0.53 |  | 0.79 | 0.33 | 0.51 | 0.85 | 0.79 |
|  | To monitor the school's progress from year to year | 0.18 | -0.01 | 0.53 | 0.67 |  | 0.53 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.91 |
|  | To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.55 | 0.47 | 0.65 |  | 0.62 | 0.54 | 0.64 |
|  | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved | 0.29 | -0.07 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 0.68 | 0.63 |  | 0.58 | 0.78 |
|  | To compare the school with other schools | 0.05 | -0.21 | 0.48 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.61 | 0.42 |  | 0.72 |
| Index of assessment practices (sum of "yes" responses to these eight purposes) |  | 0.32 | 0.11 | 0.62 | 0.72 | 0.85 | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.69 |  |

Note: Correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are indicated in bold and at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are in italic.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.30.
StatLink नinा

A summary index of assessment practices is created by summing up how many times principals responded "yes" to the eight suggested uses of student assessments mentioned above. In theory, this index ranges from 0 to 8 , but in fact the data show that it varies from 0 to 6 , as no principal reported using assessments in seven or eight ways. This index mainly reflects principals' responses to all individual questions asked regarding the uses of assessments except "to make decisions about students' retention or promotion" (Figure IV.4.12). Across OECD countries, 33\% of students are in schools whose principals reported that they use student assessments for six of the eight purposes; $26 \%$ are in schools that use student assessments for five of the eight purposes; $20 \%$ are in schools that use assessments for four of the eight purposes; and $21 \%$ are in schools that use student assessments for at most three of the eight purposes. In the Russian Federation, student assessments seems to be used for many purposes in most schools, as over $90 \%$ of students attend schools that use student assessments for six of the eight purposes. By contrast, in Greece, Switzerland, Finland, Denmark and Belgium, student assessments are not used for many of these purposes: more than $40 \%$ of students in these countries attend schools that use student assessments for at most three of the eight purposes (Table IV.4.30).

Figure IV.4.13
Use of achievement data for accountability purposes


Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students in schools where achievement data are posted publicly. Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.31.
StatLink 氖iा

## The use of achievement data beyond school

Achievement data are used for accountability purposes involving some stakeholders beyond school, teachers, partners and students. School principals were asked to report on whether achievement data are posted publicly, or tracked over time by an administrative authority. On average across OECD countries, $45 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that achievement data are posted publicly. In the United States, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and New Zealand over $80 \%$ of students attend such schools, while in Finland, Belgium, Shanghai-China, Japan, Austria, Switzerland, Argentina, Macao-China and Uruguay, fewer than 10\% of students do (Figure IV.4.13 and Table IV.4.31).

Tracking achievement data over time seems to be a more common practice than posting such data publicly. On average across OECD countries, $72 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that achievement data are tracked over time by an administrative authority. In 31 countries and economies, over $80 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported this, while only in Japan do fewer than $10 \%$ of students ( $7 \%$ ) attend such schools (Figure IV.4.13 and Table IV.4.31).

## Quality assurance

Schools also use measures other than student assessments to monitor the quality of the education they provide. PISA 2012 asked school principals to report on whether their schools use various measures related to quality assurance and improvement. Chapter 1 shows that the degree to which a system seeks feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources tends to be related to the system's overall performance; and also tends to be related to equity. In New Zealand, Liechtenstein, Shanghai-China, Turkey, Qatar, the Netherlands and Singapore, over 85\% of students attend schools whose principals reported that the school seeks written feedback from students. In contrast, in France, Luxembourg, Ireland, Greece, Tunisia, Belgium and Denmark, fewer than $40 \%$ of students attend such schools (Figure IV.4.14 and Table IV.4.32).

Chapter 1 also shows that, across all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, systems where more schools use teacher mentoring for quality-assurance and improvement purposes tend to show a weaker impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance. On average across OECD countries, $72 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that teacher mentoring is used for these purposes. In 37 countries and economies, over $80 \%$ of students attend such schools; in France, Iceland, Chile, Spain, Costa Rica, Germany and Argentina, fewer than $50 \%$ of students do (Figure IV.4.14 and Table IV.4.32).

A recent OECD review of evaluation and assessment in education concluded that it is important to engage all school staff and students in school self-evaluations, and to use student feedback about teachers for formative purposes (OECD, 2013a). While student feedback can help identify certain problems in teachers' practices, it cannot replace relevant professional feedback, advice and support by teaching experts since students are not pedagogical experts.

On average across OECD countries, $59 \%$ of students attend schools where students' written feedback is combined with other forms of evaluation (i.e. internal and/or external evaluations), while only $2 \%$ of students attend schools where students' written feedback is sought but neither internal nor external evaluations are used. Some $15 \%$ of students in Greece and $9 \%$ of students in Norway attend schools where students' written feedback is sought but neither internal nor external evaluations are used. Around 6\% of students in Uruguay and Austria attend such schools (Figure IV.4.15 and Table IV.4.33).

As shown in Figure IV.4.14, school principals were also asked about other measures used related to the quality of teachers and schools. On average across OECD countries:

- $87 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that internal evaluations or self-evaluations are used;
- $86 \%$ are in schools that have written specifications of the school's curriculum and education goals;
- $85 \%$ are in schools that systematically record data, including teacher and student attendance and graduation rates, test results and professional development of teachers;
- $74 \%$ are in schools that have written specifications of student-performance standards;
- $63 \%$ are in schools that use external evaluations;
- $62 \%$ are in schools that implement a standardised policy for teaching mathematics, such as a school curriculum with shared instructional materials accompanied by staff development and training; and
- $43 \%$ are in schools that regularly consult with one or more experts over a period of at least six months, with the aim of improving the school.
- Figure IV.4.14

Quality assurance and school improvement


Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.32.


## Internal or external evaluations and feedback from students

| Percentage of students | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that there are: |
| :---: | :---: |
| in schools whose principal | Internal and/or external evaluations, and written feedback from students is sought |
| reported that their schools seek written feedback | Internal and/or external evaluations, but no written feedback from students is sought |
|  | Neither internal nor external evaluations, and no written feedback from students is sought |
| (e.g. regarding lessons, teachers or resources) | - Neither internal nor external evaluations, but written feedback from students is sought |



Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school has internal and/or external evaluations and seeks written feedback from students.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.4.32 and IV.4.33.
StatLink 侢政 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Chapter 1 shows that, in the systems where a standardised policy for mathematics is implemented more widely, school autonomy is positively related to performance. In Qatar, Shanghai-China, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Kazakhstan, Singapore, Albania and the Czech Republic, over $90 \%$ of students attend schools where a standardised policy for mathematics is implemented. In contrast, in Denmark, Norway, Uruguay, Sweden, Lithuania, Japan and Spain, fewer than $40 \%$ of students attend such schools (Figure IV.4.14 and Table IV.4.32).

A standardised policy for mathematics and school autonomy in establishing the curriculum and assessments are not mutually exclusive. At the system level, there is no relationship between the proportion of students in schools that use a standardised policy for mathematics and the index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessments (i.e. the correlation coefficient between the two is 0.04 across OECD countries) (Tables IV.4.3 and IV.4.32).

## Monitoring mathematics teachers' practices

To examine in greater detail how the practice of mathematics teachers is monitored to ensure quality of teaching, PISA 2012 asked school principals to report on whether the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers in their schools: test or assessments of student achievement; teacher peer review of lessons plans, assessment instruments, and lessons; principal or senior staff observations of lessons; and observation of classes by inspectors or other persons external to the school. On average across OECD countries, $78 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that tests or assessments of student achievement have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers; $69 \%$ are in schools where the principal or senior staff observe lessons; $60 \%$ are in schools that use teacher peer reviews of lesson plans, assessment instruments, and lessons; and $27 \%$ are in schools where classes are observed by inspectors or other persons external to the school (Figure IV.4.16 and Table IV.4.34).

In general, those countries that use one of these methods also use other methods. For example, across OECD countries, the percentage of students who attend schools that use teacher peer review and those who attend schools that use principal or senior staff observations of lessons are highly correlated (correlation coefficient is 0.59 ). The only exception is "observation of classes by inspectors or other persons external to the school". Among OECD countries, the proportion of students in schools using this method seems to be unrelated to the proportion of students in schools using other methods.

In Albania, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Shanghai-China, Thailand and the United Kingdom, over $90 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that the school uses tests or assessments of student achievement, teacher peer review, and principal or senior staff observations of lessons, while in Greece, Finland, France and Ireland, the use of these three methods is much less prevalent than the OECD average. By contrast, in Jordan, Shanghai-China, Tunisia, Liechtenstein, Viet Nam, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Kazakhstan, more than $80 \%$ of students attend a school where classes are observed by inspectors or other persons external to the school, while in Italy, Finland, Portugal, Slovenia, Luxembourg, Estonia and Chinese Taipei fewer than $10 \%$ of students do (Figure IV.4.16 and Table IV.4.34).

## The consequences of teacher appraisals

Teacher appraisals can have many consequences, both positive and negative. On average across OECD countries, $81 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that appraisals of and/or feedback to teachers lead directly to a role in school-development initiatives (e.g. curriculum-development group, development of school objectives); 79\% are in schools where these lead directly to public recognition from the principal; $73 \%$ are in schools where these lead directly to opportunities for professional-development activities; $68 \%$ are in schools where these lead directly to changes in work responsibilities that make the job more attractive; $53 \%$ are in schools where these lead directly to a change in the likelihood of career advancement; $30 \%$ are in schools where these lead directly to a financial bonus or another kind of monetary reward; and $27 \%$ are in schools where these lead directly to a change in salary (Figure IV.4.17 and Table IV.4.35).

Across countries, the proportions of students in schools whose principals reported that teacher appraisals have one of these seven consequences are highly correlated. This means that countries with more students in schools where teacher appraisals have one of the abovementioned seven consequences also tend to have more students in schools where teacher appraisal has other consequences as well. For example, among OECD countries, in those countries where "a role in school-development initiatives" is frequently seen as a consequence of teacher appraisal, "a change in the likelihood of career advancement" is also a common consequence of teacher appraisal (correlation coefficient is 0.66 ).

- Figure IV.4.16 -

Monitoring mathematics teachers' practice

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers at their schools: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tests or assessments of student achievement | Teacher peer review of lesson plans, assessment instruments, and lessons | Principal or senior staff observations of lessons | Observation of classes <br> by inspectors or other persons external to the school |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | Australia | 79 | 77 | 70 | 11 |
| 0 | Austria | 91 | 79 | 74 | 29 |
|  | Belgium | 66 | 76 | 65 | 48 |
|  | Canada | 73 | 60 | 82 | 21 |
|  | Chile | 77 | 80 | 91 | 25 |
|  | Czech Republic | 92 | 67 | 98 | 33 |
|  | Denmark | 75 | 41 | 64 | 17 |
|  | Estonia | 71 | 49 | 90 | 8 |
|  | Finland | 40 | 19 | 31 | 2 |
|  | France | 61 | 42 | 12 | 73 |
|  | Germany | 72 | 45 | 67 | 22 |
|  | Greece | 60 | 26 | 8 | 21 |
|  | Hungary | 74 | 75 | 97 | 13 |
|  | Iceland | 84 | 12 | 46 | 25 |
|  | Ireland | 65 | 34 | 13 | 48 |
|  | Israel | 96 | 51 | 75 | 34 |
|  | Italy | 74 | 87 | 17 | 1 |
|  | Japan | 69 | 54 | 81 | 26 |
|  | Korea | 84 | 99 | 96 | 68 |
|  | Luxembourg | 81 | 63 | 48 | 6 |
|  | Mexico | 93 | 76 | 77 | 41 |
|  | Netherlands | 83 | 54 | 87 | 42 |
|  | New Zealand | 84 | 92 | 97 | 32 |
|  | Norway | 72 | 54 | 48 | 11 |
|  | Poland | 100 | 64 | 94 | 16 |
|  | Portugal | 98 | 71 | 60 | 4 |
|  | Slovak Republic | 75 | 84 | 98 | 27 |
|  | Slovenia | 72 | 62 | 94 | 5 |
|  | Spain | 78 | 22 | 10 | 15 |
|  | Sweden | 68 | 59 | 80 | 27 |
|  | Switzerland | 61 | 63 | 83 | 29 |
|  | Turkey | 92 | 52 | 94 | 22 |
|  | United Kingdom | 95 | 93 | 97 | 68 |
|  | United States | 89 | 66 | 100 | 42 |
|  | OECD average | 78 | 60 | 69 | 27 |
|  | Albania | 98 | 92 | 99 | 62 |
| $\stackrel{1}{3}$ | Argentina | 82 | 74 | 85 | 22 |
| 2 | Brazil | 88 | 75 | 50 | 23 |
|  | Bulgaria | 91 | 29 | 97 | 49 |
|  | Colombia | 84 | 60 | 43 | 11 |
|  | Costa Rica | 83 | 81 | 87 | 45 |
|  | Croatia | 72 | 62 | 93 | 34 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 95 | 85 | 97 | 39 |
|  | Indonesia | 91 | 91 | 95 | 77 |
|  | Jordan | 94 | 93 | 98 | 97 |
|  | Kazakhstan | 99 | 99 | 100 | 82 |
|  | Latvia | 83 | 89 | 100 | 41 |
|  | Liechtenstein | 82 | 70 | 49 | 87 |
|  | Lithuania | 96 | 75 | 98 | 38 |
|  | Macao-China | 90 | 88 | 96 | 48 |
|  | Malaysia | 99 | 91 | 99 | 70 |
|  | Montenegro | 81 | 72 | 99 | 56 |
|  | Peru | 71 | 80 | 84 | 54 |
|  | Qatar | 97 | 98 | 100 | 82 |
|  | Romania | 68 | 69 | 73 | 58 |
|  | Russian Federation | 99 | 96 | 100 | 44 |
|  | Serbia | 50 | 59 | 95 | 34 |
|  | Shanghai-China | 92 | 91 | 97 | 90 |
|  | Singapore | 96 | 86 | 100 | 23 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 82 | 61 | 61 | 8 |
|  | Thailand | 98 | 93 | 95 | 45 |
|  | Tunisia | 75 | 40 | 50 | 87 |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 96 | 85 | 100 | 84 |
|  | Uruguay | 58 | 63 | 88 | 66 |
|  | Viet Nam | 98 | 83 | 97 | 85 |

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.34.
StatLink (त्ञाड़ा http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

Figure IV.4.17
Consequences of teacher appraisals


Note: The percentage refers to the percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that appraisals of and/or feedback to teachers lead directly to at least a small change. Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.35.
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957346

## Box IV.4.4. Teachers' perceptions of the consequences of appraisals: results from the first TALIS survey ${ }^{10}$

The consequences for teachers of teacher appraisals and feedback vary significantly across systems and, within systems, by individual teachers. Overall, data from the first OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) (2007-08) show that in most participating countries, direct consequences for teachers' career and compensation are small or non-existent. However, teachers overwhelmingly report positive impact on their job satisfaction, and report that they find the feedback they received helpful for improving their work. ${ }^{11}$ While teachers' perceptions of the impact of assessments may depend on whether the appraisal was positive or negative, and on which aspects of their work were reviewed, TALIS is able to provide a system-level measure of teachers' perceptions about the consequences of appraisal and feedback by surveying a large, representative sample of teachers.

## Direct impact of appraisal and feedback on career and compensation

For most teachers surveyed in TALIS, the appraisal and feedback they received had little direct impact on their career or compensation. On average across participating countries, only $9 \%$ of teachers reported a moderate or large impact on their salary, and fewer than $11 \%$ reported an impact on a bonus or other monetary reward. Around $16 \%$ of teachers reported a (moderate or large) change in the likelihood of career advancement as a result of the appraisal or feedback received. Higher percentages are found in Central and East European countries, in Mexico, and in the partner countries Brazil and Malaysia.

This indicates that in most countries, career paths and teacher compensation are only indirectly linked, if at all, to teacher appraisal and feedback. This finding is consistent with the results of an OECD review of policy frameworks for teacher appraisal. Of the 28 systems reviewed, 22 had a regulatory framework for teacher appraisal. Only in Chile, Korea and Mexico are teacher appraisals linked to a reward scheme; and only in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Israel, Korea and Poland are teacher appraisals used to determine promotions. Most often, teacher appraisals are used in the context of a probationary period ( 13 countries) or of regular school-based appraisals ( 17 countries) (OECD, 2013b, p.16).

## Impact of appraisal and feedback on public recognition and job satisfaction

For teachers who receive appraisals and/or feedback, a far more common outcome is some form of public recognition, either from the school principal or from teachers' colleagues. An average of more than one in three teachers ( $36 \%$ ) reported a moderate or large change in the recognition they received; in Bulgaria, Lithuania, Malaysia and Poland, more than one in two teachers so reported. Some $30 \%$ of teachers, on average, reported that as a result of the appraisal and feedback they were given a role in school-development initiatives.

On average across countries, $51 \%$ of teachers reported a positive change in job satisfaction following the appraisal and/or feedback they received. In Malaysia and Mexico, more than one in three teachers reported "a large increase" in job satisfaction; in Brazil, Iceland and Poland, more than one in five teachers so reported. In most countries, very few teachers reported less job satisfaction after an appraisal/feedback, with larger proportions of discontent (more than $10 \%$ ) found only in Korea and Turkey. TALIS thus shows that the effect of appraisal and feedback on teacher morale is largely positive.

## Impact of appraisal and feedback on teaching and teachers' work

For $58 \%$ of teachers, the appraisal and feedback received also contained suggestions for improving certain aspects of teachers' work. Whether it contained specific suggestions or not, more than three out of four teachers agreed that the feedback and/or appraisal they received was helpful for improving their work as teachers. While only 53\% of teachers in Korea reported so, more than $90 \%$ of teachers in Bulgaria and Malaysia did.

Teachers were also asked which teaching practices they changed as a result of the feedback and/or appraisal they received. In general, more than one in three teachers changed their instructional practices and/or their classroommanagement practices as a result of feedback on their work as teachers. In many countries, more teachers reported
a moderate or large impact on their classroom-management practices, or on their handling of student discipline and behaviour problems, than on their instructional practices. In contrast, in Austria, Estonia, Italy, Korea, Lithuania, Malaysia and the Slovak Republic, more teachers reported changes in their instructional practices than in their classroom-management practices.

Sources:<br>OECD (2013b), Teachers for the 21 st Century: Using Evaluation to Improve Teaching, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264193864-en<br>OECD (2009), Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264072992-en

## TRENDS IN ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY POLICIES SINCE PISA 2003

Between PISA 2003 and 2012 there has been a clear trend towards using student assessments to compare the school's performance to district or national performance and to compare the schools' performance to that of other schools. For example, and on average across OECD countries, in 2003, 46\% of students attended schools whose principal reported that the school uses student assessment data to compare itself against national or district performance; by 2012, 62\% of students attended such schools (Figure IV.4.18 and Table IV.4.36). ${ }^{12}$ Similarly, the percentage of students who attended schools that use assessment data to compare themselves to other schools increased from $40 \%$ to $52 \%$ during the period. Student assessment data are also increasingly used to make judgements about teachers' effectiveness (an increase of nine percentage points, on average across OECD countries) and to identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved (an increase of six percentage points). In fact, assessment data are increasingly being used to monitor a school's progress from year to year (in 25 countries and economies), to compare the school with other schools (in 25 countries and economies), to compare the school's performance with national or district performance (in 23 countries and economies), and to make judgements about teachers' effectiveness (in 19 countries and economies) (Table IV.4.36). ${ }^{13}$

The use of student-assessment data for various purposes has increased most notably in Ireland and Denmark between 2003 and 2012. In Ireland, for example, students in 2012 were 60 percentage points more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to attend schools where student assessment data were used to compare the school with national or district performance (Figure IV.4.18); 37 percentage points more likely to be in schools where the data were used to monitor the school's progress from year to year; and more than 25 percentage points more likely to be in schools that used student assessments to judge teachers' effectiveness, to identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved or to compare the school with other schools. In Denmark, students were at least 20 percentage points more likely in 2012 than in 2003 to attend schools where student-assessment data are used to group students for instructional purposes, inform parents about students' progress, compare the school's performance against national or district performance, monitor school progress, compare the school with other schools, identify aspects of the curriculum that could be improved, and make judgements about teachers' effectiveness (Table IV.4.36).

By contrast, the use of student assessments has declined in Finland and Hungary. In both of these countries, students in 2012 were less likely than their counterparts in 2003 to attend schools where assessments were used to make judgements about teachers' effectiveness. In Finland, students were less likely in 2012 than in 2003 to attend schools where assessment data are used to compare the school to other schools or to national or district performance. In Hungary, students were also less likely to attend schools where their assessment is used to make retention or promotion decisions or to identify aspects of the curriculum that could be improved, although assessment data are more likely to be used to group students for instructional purposes. Students in the Slovak Republic were less likely in 2012 than in 2003 to attend schools where assessment is used to group students for instruction purposes or to monitor school progress, but assessment data are being used more to compare the school with other schools. In Poland students in 2012 were also less likely than their counterparts in 2003 to attend schools where assessment data are used to compare school performance against national or regional benchmarks, but more likely to attend schools that use assessment data to group students for instructional purposes (Table IV.4.36).

Change between 2003 and 2012 in using student assessment data to compare school performance Percentage of students in schools where school performance is compared against regional or national benchmarks



Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The percentage-point difference in the share of students attending schools where student assessment data are used to compare the school against regional or national benchmarks in 2012 and 2003 (2012-2003) is shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown. OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable data since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students in school where the principal reported using assessment data to compare the school against regional or national benchmarks in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.36.


As discussed above, teachers' practices can be monitored in several ways: through student achievement tests, peer reviews of lesson plans, class observations by the principal or senior staff or by external inspectors. With the exception of external observations, all of these types of teacher-monitoring practices have become more common since 2003. On average across OECD countries with comparable data from 2003 to 2012, students in 2012 were 20 percentage points more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to attend schools where the use of tests or assessments of student achievement are used to monitor teacher practice, and around eight percentage points more likely to attend schools that use peer reviews of lesson plans or principal or senior staff observations of lessons to the same end (Figure IV.4.19 and Table IV.4.37).

Using student assessments to monitor teachers' practices has become prevalent in PISA-participating countries and economies. In 2003, among all countries and economies with comparable data, 17 were those where fewer than $60 \%$ of students attended schools where student assessments were used to monitor teacher practices. By 2012, in only three countries with comparable data from 2003 - Greece, Uruguay and Finland - did fewer than $60 \%$ of students attend such schools; and in Finland, fewer than $40 \%$ of students attended such schools. In addition, 23 countries and economies saw an increase of more than 10 percentage points in the proportion of students who attend schools that use student assessments to monitor teachers' practices; and among the 14 countries and economies showing less of an increase or no increase, six showed more than $90 \%$ of students in such schools in 2003. Only two countries bucked this trend: Latvia, where the share of students in these types of schools decreased by 12 percentage points (from $95 \%$ in 2003 to $83 \%$ in 2012) and Finland, where fewer than $40 \%$ of students attend such schools (Figure IV.4.19 and Table IV.4.37).

Change between 2003 and 2012 in using student assessment data to monitor teachers
Percentage of students in schools whose principals report that student assessment is used to monitor mathematics teachers' practice


Notes: Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
The percentage-point difference in the share of students attending schools where student assessment data are used for teacher monitoring purposes in 2012 and 2003 (2012-2003) are shown above the country/economy name. Only statistically significant differences are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable data since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students in school where the principal reported to use assessment data for teacher monitoring purposes in 2012.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.4.37.


In 15 countries and economies with comparable data, it was at least ten percentage points more common in 2012 than in 2003 for students to attend schools where teachers were monitored through peer reviews of lesson plans, assessment instruments and lessons. These increases are notable in Sweden and Luxembourg, where the share of students attending such schools increased by more than 30 percentage points during the period. Only in Turkey, Tunisia, Spain and Finland did this proportion shrink by more than ten percentage points. In Turkey the percentage of students who attend schools where teachers are monitored through observations by external experts also decreased; but this drop was concurrent with an increase in the proportion of students in schools where teachers are monitored through student assessments. Tunisia also saw a decrease in the percentage of students in schools where teachers are monitored through observations by the principal or other senior staff (Table IV.4.37).

## Notes

1. The ratio of the number of items for which "principals" and/or "teachers" have responsibility to the number of items for which "regional or local education authority" and/or "national education authority" have responsibility was computed. "School governing board " was not considered in the calculation.
2. System-level correlation between the index of school responsibility for resource allocation and the index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment is 0.56 across OECD countries and 0.60 across all participating countries and economies. In Japan, the value on the index of school responsibility for resource allocation is relatively low compared with other countries, while the value on the index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment is relatively high. In Bulgaria, the value on the index of school responsibility for resource allocation is relatively high, while the value on the index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment is relatively low.
3. See Gewirtz, Ball and Bowe, 1995; Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1998; Karsten, 1999; Viteritti, 1999; Plank and Sykes, 2003; Hsieh and Urquiola, 2006; Heyneman, 2009; Bunar, 2010a; Bunar, 2010b; Söderström and Uusitalo, 2010; and Schneider and Buckley, 2002.
4. The parent questionnaire was distributed in Belgium (Flemish community), Chile, Croatia, Germany, Hong Kong-China, Hungary, Italy, Korea, Macao-China, Mexico and Portugal. Table III.6.14 (available on line) shows that in most countries and economies that distributed the parental questionnaire, participation was high, and the parents of virtually all students who participated in PISA responded to the questionnaire. Response rates were as high as $90 \%$ or more in Chile, Croatia, Hong Kong-China, Hungary, Italy, Korea, Macao-China and Mexico. The response rate in Portugal was $83 \%$, while it was comparatively low in Germany ( $57 \%$ ) and the Flemish community of Belgium ( $48 \%$ ). Response rates for individual items vary as some parents responded to several questions but not to others. However, the extent of non-response to items in the parental questionnaire is similar to that of non-response to items in the student background questionnaire. Table III.6.14 illustrates how, in Belgium (Flemish community) and Germany, where response rates are low, and in Portugal, students whose parents responded to the parental questionnaire tend to score higher in PISA and have a more socio-economically advantaged status.
5. This average corresponds to the OECD average of countries that have comparable data in both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012.
6. This was also true in 19 countries and economies that participated in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012.
7. The PISA 2003 questionnaires did not include questions about principals' perspectives on school choice, leadership or parental involvement. Although PISA 2003 asked school principals about school autonomy as PISA 2012 did, the wording of these questions changed substantially, making it impossible to analyse trends in school autonomy. In the PISA 2003 questionnaire, school principals were asked "In your school, who has the main responsibility for <each governance attribute>" and offered the following response options: "Not a main responsibility of the school", "School's governing board", "Principal", "Department Head" or "Teachers". In the PISA 2012 questionnaire, school principals were asked "Regarding your school, who has a considerable responsibility for <each governance attribute>" and offered the following response options: "Principal", "Teachers", "School governing board", "Regional or local education authority", "National education authority". In both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, school principals could select as many response options as appropriate.
8. Information is available for all OECD countries except Canada, New Zealand and Slovenia. Information is available for all participating partner countries and economies except Argentina, Costa Rica, Kazakhstan and Serbia. Turkey and Switzerland do not have information on the existence of assessments so they are excluded from the analysis.
9. These groups are created using a cluster analysis with the Ward method, which groups countries and economies to minimise the variance within each cluster, using data available in Tables IV.4.20 to IV.4.26. Variables that entered the analyses are: the existence of national assessments in lower secondary and upper secondary schools, the percentage of students taking national examinations in lower and upper secondary general programmes, the percentage of students taking other examinations in lower and upper secondary general programmes, and the percentage of tertiary fields of study requiring a non-secondary school examination for access. For those countries and economies where the percentage of students taking the examinations is unavailable, if examinations are compulsory, a percentage of 100 is used (Viet Nam), and if not compulsory, a percentage of 50 is used (Australia, upper secondary education). When the percentage of students taking other examinations is missing, a percentage value of 0 is used if no information on other examinations is provided (Australia, Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Tunisia, Turkey and Viet Nam); if these examinations do exist, then a value of 50 is used (Japan). When the number of fields of study requiring a tertiary examination is missing, a value of 0 is used (Tunisia).
10. The following countries and economies participated in the first TALIS survey, TALIS 2008: Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish community), Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Korea, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, and the partner countries Brazil, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Malaysia and Malta. For the second TALIS survey, TALIS 2013, the following countries and economies are participating: Australia, Belgium (Flemish community), Canada (Alberta), Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom (England), the United States, and the partner countries Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Malaysia, Romania, Serbia, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates.
11. There is a possibility that certain negative consequences, such as teachers who were discouraged and left the profession or who were discharged from a particular school, is under-reported, because these teachers did not remain in the same school.
12. This average trend corresponds to the OECD average of countries that have comparable data in both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. When rounded, the percentages of $84.65,11.49$ and 3.85 adds up to 101 .
13. PISA 2012 also asked school principals about quality assurance and teacher appraisals. Because PISA 2003 did not include these questions, it is not possible to determine trends over time for these two aspects of assessment and accountability.
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# How the Quality of the Learning Environment is Shaped 

This chapter discusses student- and teacher-related aspects of the learning environment, including student truancy, teacher-student relations, the disciplinary climate and teacher morale. It also examines trends in school climate and student truancy since 2003.

This chapter describes the learning environment and examines how it is related to other aspects of school organisation discussed in Chapters 2 through 4. The aspects of learning environments related to the issues of student truancy and school climate that are discussed in this chapter are summarised in Figure IV.5.1. Student truancy not only hurts the individual student, but when it is pervasive, it hurts the entire class. School climate such as the good quality of relationships and the general orderly atmosphere are important characteristics of effective schools. Chapter 1 shows that student truancy tends to be negatively related to both systems' and schools' overall performance; and a favourable disciplinary climate is consistently related to higher average performance at the school level. In general, learning environments improved between 2003 and 2012: more students reported positive teacher-student relations and positive disciplinary climates, and principals were more likely to report that teacher- and student-related factors rarely hindered learning.

- Figure IV.5.1 -

The learning environment as covered in PISA 2012


## What the data tell us

- In virtually all school systems, schools with more negative disciplinary climates tend to have a higher incidence of students arriving late for school or skipping a day of school or a class.
- On average among OECD countries, schools with a more negative disciplinary climate tend to have a largely disadvantaged student population, have greater socio-economic diversity among students, and suffer from more teacher shortages.
- Consistent with trends showing that the overall learning environment improved between 2003 and 2012, students in 2012 were slightly less likely than students in 2003 to report that they had arrived late for school. According to students' reports, teacher-student relations have also improved during the period in all but one country, Tunisia, where they remained stable.


## STUDENT TRUANCY

Student truancy (e.g. arriving late for school, unauthorised non-attendance) not only has serious adverse consequences on the lives of individual young people, but it can also cut into school learning time and distract from learning (Robins and Ratcliff, 1978; Gamoran and Nystrand 1992; Lamdin, 1996; Caldas, 1993; Hallfors et al., 2002; Roby, 2004; Fantuzzo, Grim and Hazan 2005; Henry, 2007; Sheldon, 2007; Saab and Klinger, 2010). If students who arrive late or skip classes fall far behind in their classwork and require extra assistance, the flow of instruction is disrupted and all students in the class may suffer.

## Arriving late for school

PISA 2012 asked students to report the number of times they arrived late for school during the two weeks prior to the assessment. Across OECD countries, $65 \%$ of students reported that they had not arrived late for school during that period, $25 \%$ reported that they had arrived late once or twice, and $10 \%$ reported that they had arrived late three or more times. In Uruguay, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Latvia, Sweden, Portugal, Israel, Chile, Peru and Tunisia, 50\% to $60 \%$ of students had arrived late at least once in the prior two weeks. By contrast, around $15 \%$ to $19 \%$ of students in Hong Kong-China, Viet Nam, Shanghai-China and Liechtenstein had arrived late at least once, and $9 \%$ of students in Japan had arrived late at least once (Table IV.5.1).

Are students who arrive late for school concentrated in certain schools, or can they be found in any school? In order to answer this question, students' reports on arriving late for school were aggregated at the school level to calculate the proportion of students who had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test (Figure IV.5.2). As shown in Figure IV.5.2, across OECD countries, 8\% of students are in schools where one in ten students or fewer had arrived late for school during that period, $24 \%$ of students are in schools where between one in ten students and one in four students had arrived late for school at least once, $47 \%$ of students are in schools where between one and two in four students had arrived late for school, and $21 \%$ are in schools where more than two in four students had arrived late for school at least once in the previous two weeks. In Uruguay, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Latvia, Sweden, Portugal, Israel, Peru, Tunisia, Chile and Greece, $50 \%$ to $80 \%$ of students are in schools where more than half of students had arrived late for school at least once in the previous two weeks. By contrast, in Shanghai-China, Hong Kong-China, Japan, Liechtenstein, Singapore, Viet Nam, Chinese Taipei, Luxembourg and Germany, fewer than 5\% of students attend such schools. In Japan, 65\% of students are in schools where one in ten students or fewer had arrived late for school during that period (Table IV.5.2).

In all school systems, the proportion of 15-year-old students who arrived late for school varies across schools. However, in some systems, these students seem to be concentrated in certain schools, while in other systems these students are distributed more equitably among all schools. For example, around $39 \%$ of students had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test in Denmark and Montenegro (Figure IV.5.2 and Table IV.5.1). But these students are more concentrated in certain schools in Denmark than in Montenegro. In Montenegro, $83 \%$ of students are in schools where from one to two in four students had arrived late, while in Denmark, $52 \%$ of students are in such schools. Thus, in Montenegro, students will have similar experiences with late-arriving peers no matter which school they attend, while in Denmark, students' experiences with late-arriving peers will vary greatly, depending on the school they attend (Table IV.5.2).

## Skipping school

Students were asked to report the number of times they skipped a whole day of school and the number of times they skipped some classes during the two weeks before the assessment. Across OECD countries, $85 \%$ of students reported that they had not skipped a day of school, $12 \%$ had skipped a day of school once or twice, and $3 \%$ had skipped a day of school three times or more during those two weeks. Similarly, across OECD countries, $82 \%$ of students had not skipped classes, $14 \%$ skipped classes once or twice, and $4 \%$ had skipped classes three times or more during that period (Table IV.5.3).

In Argentina and Turkey, more than 50\% of students had skipped a day of school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test, while in Shanghai-China, Japan, Korea, Liechtenstein, Iceland, the Netherlands, Hong Kong-China, Ireland, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Macao-China and Switzerland, fewer than $5 \%$ of students had done so. In general, those countries with high proportions of students who had skipped a day of school also tend to have high proportions of students who skip classes, while those countries and economies with small proportions of students who had skipped a day of school also tend to have small proportions of students who had skipped classes. An exception is Latvia, where about one in five students reported that he or she had skipped a day of school at least once during the period, while about two out of three students reported to have skipped classes at least once (Table IV.5.3).

Are students who skip a day of school concentrated in certain schools? Across OECD countries, an average of $27 \%$ of students are in schools where one in ten students or fewer reported that they had skipped a day or a class in the two weeks prior to the PISA test; $31 \%$ are in schools where between one in ten students and one in four students reported to have done so at least once; $30 \%$ are in schools where between a quarter and half of students reported to have done so; and $13 \%$ are in schools where more than half of students reported to have done so. In Argentina, Latvia, Turkey, Italy, Jordan, Romania, Costa Rica and the United Arab Emirates, over 50\% of students attend schools where more than half of students reported that they had skipped a day of school or a class at least once in the two weeks prior to the assessment (Table IV.5.4).

## Students arriving late for school

|  | Students arriving late for school |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Percentage of students who are in schools where: |
|  | $\square 10 \%$ of students or fewer had arrived late at least once... |
|  | $\square$ More than $10 \%$ but $25 \%$ of students or fewer had arrived late at least once... |
| Percentage of students <br> who had arrived late <br> at least once | $\square$ More than $25 \%$ but $50 \%$ of students or fewer had arrived late at least once... |
|  | $\square$ Over $50 \%$ of students had arrived late at least once... $\quad$..in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |



Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the percentage of students who had arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the assessment Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.5. 1 and IV.5.2


## SCHOOL CLIMATE

Research into what makes schools effective finds that learning requires an orderly and co-operative environment both in and outside the classroom (Jennings and Greenberg, 2009). In effective schools, academic activities and student performance are valued by both students and teachers (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Sammons, 1999; Taylor, Pressley and Pearson, 2002). The school climate encompasses not only norms and values but also the quality of teacher-student relations and the general atmosphere (OECD, 2013). How does the climate in a classroom - e.g. the degree of discipline among students, the quality of the relationship between students and their teachers, the values promoted and shared between teacher and student and among the students themselves - vary, and how does it affect teaching and learning? Research has found that students, particularly disadvantaged students, learn more and have fewer disciplinary problems when they feel that their teachers take them seriously (Gamoran, 1993) and when they have strong and affective bonds with their teachers (Crosnoe, Johnson and Elder, 2004). Through these positive relationships, social capital is transmitted, communal learning environments are created, and adherence to norms conducive to learning are both promoted and strengthened (Birch and Ladd, 1998).

## Teacher-student relations

Students were asked to indicate whether and to what extent they agree with several statements regarding their relationships with teachers at school, including whether they get along with their teachers, whether teachers are interested in their personal well-being, whether teachers take the student seriously, whether teachers are a source of support if the student needs extra help, and whether teachers treat the student fairly. These responses were combined to create a composite index of teacher-student relations such that the index has an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate that students have a more positive perception of teacher-student relations. When comparing estimates across school systems, it is important to keep in mind that several factors beyond students' experiences in school may determine the patterns of these responses.

On average across OECD countries, at least three out of four students agreed or strongly agreed with four of these statements, as presented in Figure IV.5.3:

- $82 \%$ of students agreed or strongly agreed that students get along well with most teachers. While in Kazakhstan, Indonesia, Shanghai-China, Singapore, Hong Kong-China, Albania, Macao-China, Costa Rica, Portugal, Mexico, Thailand and Malaysia, over $90 \%$ of students responded so, fewer than $75 \%$ of students in Viet Nam, Qatar, Poland, Greece and Italy responded so.
- $82 \%$ of students agreed or strongly agreed that they would receive extra help from their teachers if they need it. In Viet Nam, Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China, Indonesia, Singapore, Canada, Portugal, Hong Kong-China, the United Kingdom, Thailand and Albania, over 90\% of students responded so, while in Austria, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Croatia, Israel, Tunisia, Greece and Slovenia, fewer than $75 \%$ of students responded so.
- $81 \%$ of students agreed or strongly agreed that most of their teachers treat them fairly. Over $90 \%$ of students in Colombia, Albania, Kazakhstan and Shanghai-China responded so, while in Poland, France, Tunisia, Turkey, Greece and Macao-China, fewer than $75 \%$ of students responded so.
- $77 \%$ of students agreed or strongly agreed that most teachers are interested in students' well being. Over $90 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan, Indonesia, Latvia, Singapore, Portugal, Shanghai-China, Albania, Colombia and Costa Rica responded so, while in Poland, Slovenia, Japan, Tunisia, the Russian Federation and Luxembourg, at least one in three students did not respond so.
- $74 \%$ of students agreed or strongly agreed that most of their teachers really listen to what they have to say. Over $85 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan, Albania, Thailand, Peru, Portugal and Jordan responded so, while at least one in three students in Austria, Chinese Taipei, Poland, Macao-China and Germany did not respond so.

Although most students across OECD countries reported positive relationships between students and teachers, these relationships vary, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of teacher-student relations, which combines the abovementioned questions. Variation within countries (measured through the standard deviation at the student level) is smallest in the Netherlands, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Latvia, Estonia and Korea. In contrast, in Qatar, Israel, Jordan, Tunisia and Montenegro, teacher-student relations vary more (Table IV.5.5).


Note: Higher values on the index indicate better teacher-student relations.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.5.
StatLink 泀画 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957365

Students' reports on their relationship with teachers vary both between and within schools. On average across OECD countries, most of the variation in the index of teacher-student relations is seen within schools (i.e. $93 \%$ of variation is seen within schools, while $7 \%$ is observed between schools). In other words, students who attend the same school vary in the extent to which they reported good relations with their teachers. In Montenegro, Hong Kong-China, Albania, Chinese Taipei and Luxembourg, around $2.5 \%$ or less of variation in the index of teacher-student relations is observed between schools; in contrast, in Germany, Australia, Liechtenstein and Indonesia, 10\% or more of the variation is seen between schools (Figure IV.5.5 and Table IV.5.5).

## Disciplinary climate

PISA 2012 asked students to describe the frequency with which interruptions occur in mathematics lessons. This included how often - "never", "in some", "in most" or "in all" mathematics lessons - students don't listen to what the teacher says; there is noise and disorder; the teacher has to wait a long time for students to quieten down; students cannot work well; and students don't start working for a long time after the lesson begins. These responses were combined to create a composite index of disciplinary climate such that the index has an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate that students perceive a better disciplinary climate in the classroom.

Most students in OECD countries enjoy orderly classrooms during their mathematics lessons. As presented in Figure IV.5.4, on average across OECD countries:

- $78 \%$ of students reported that they never or only in some mathematics lessons cannot work well. In Viet Nam, Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China, Singapore and Korea, over $85 \%$ of students responded so, while in Tunisia, Qatar, Jordan, Argentina and Greece, $33 \%$ of students or more responded that this happens in most or every lesson.
- $73 \%$ of students reported that they never or only in some lessons don't start working for a long time after the lessons begins. Over $85 \%$ of students in Japan, Viet Nam, Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China and the Russian Federation gave this response, while over $40 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Jordan, Argentina, Brazil, the Netherlands, France and Qatar reported that this happens in most or every lesson.
- $72 \%$ of students reported that their teacher never or only in some lessons has to wait a long time for students to quiet down. Over $85 \%$ of students in Japan, Shanghai-China, Viet Nam, Kazakhstan, Hong Kong-China and Macao-China reported so, while over $40 \%$ of students in Argentina, Qatar, Chile and Tunisia reported that this happens in most or every lesson.
- $68 \%$ of students reported that students never, or only in some lessons, do not listen to what the teacher says. Over 80\% of students in Viet Nam, Japan, Shanghai-China, Thailand, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Albania and Korea reported so, while over 40\% of students in Argentina, Serbia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Qatar, Montenegro, New Zealand, Finland, Brazil, Greece and France reported that this happens in most or every lesson.
- $68 \%$ of students reported there is never, or only in some lessons, noise and disorder. Over $80 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan, Japan, Viet Nam, Shanghai-China, Albania, Macao-China, the Russian Federation and Hong Kong-China reported so, while over $40 \%$ of students in Argentina, Finland, France, Tunisia, New Zealand, Qatar, Australia, Chile and Brazil reported that this happens in most or every lesson.

Disciplinary climate often varies widely within countries and economies, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of disciplinary climate, which combines the abovementioned questions. Variations within countries and economies (i.e. the standard deviation at the student level) are the smallest in Viet Nam, Thailand, Peru, Macao-China, Malaysia and Colombia. By contrast, in Qatar and Ireland there is more variation in disciplinary climate within the country (Table IV.5.6).

Variations in the index of disciplinary climate can occur between and within schools. On average across OECD countries, $86 \%$ of the variation in the index of disciplinary climate is seen within schools, while $14 \%$ is observed between schools. Higher levels of between-school variation mean lower levels of within-school variation. In other words, students who attend the same school share similar perceptions about the disciplinary climate in their classes. In the Czech Republic, Latvia, Iceland, and Liechtenstein, $20 \%$ or more of the variation in this index is observed between schools. In contrast, in Mexico, Montenegro, Luxembourg and Albania, less than 5\% of the variation is seen between schools (Figure IV.5.4 and Table IV.5.6).

Students don't listen to what the teacher says

| B |
| :---: |
| C |
| D |
| E |

The teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down
Students cannot work well
Students don't start working for a long time after the lesson begins


Note: Higher values on the index indicate a better disciplinary climate.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.6.
StatLink 泀ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957365

## Student- and teacher-related factors affecting school climate

To examine the degree to which student behaviour influences learning, school principals were also asked to report the extent to which they think that learning in their schools is hindered by such factors as: student truancy, students skipping classes, students arriving late for school, students not attending compulsory school events or excursions, students lacking respect for teachers, disruption of classes by students, students using alcohol or illegal drugs, and students intimidating or bullying other students. The responses were combined to create an index of student-related factors affecting school climate that has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one in OECD countries. Positive values reflect principals' perceptions that students' behaviour hinders learning to a lesser extent, and negative values indicate that school principals believe that students' behaviour hinders learning to a greater extent, compared to the OECD average.

In general, student truancy and disruption of classes are reported as more of a hindrance to learning than students' use of alcohol or illegal drugs, or students intimidating other students, not participating in compulsory events, or showing a lack of respect for teachers (Figure IV.5.5). On average across OECD countries:

- $94 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students' use of alcohol or illegal drugs. Over $95 \%$ of students are in such schools in 29 participating countries and economies, while in Kazakhstan and Shanghai-China at least one in four students attends schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by students' use of alcohol or illegal drugs to some extent or a lot.
- $89 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students intimidating or bullying other students. Some $95 \%$ of students or more in Montenegro, Indonesia, Albania, the Slovak Republic, Latvia, the United Kingdom, Romania, Spain, Japan, Singapore, Lithuania and Iceland attend such schools, while over $20 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China, Finland, Colombia, the Netherlands, Brazil, Korea and Tunisia attend schools where learning hindered by students intimidating or bullying other students to some extent or a lot.
- $87 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students not attending compulsory school events, such as sports days or excursions. Over $95 \%$ of students in Iceland, the United Kingdom, Lithuania, Albania, Macao-China, Portugal and Singapore attend such schools. In contrast, at least one in four students in Tunisia, Kazakhstan, Australia, Costa Rica, Malaysia and Slovenia attends schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by students not attending compulsory school events to some extent or a lot.
- $81 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students lacking respect for teachers. Over $90 \%$ of students in Viet Nam, Indonesia, Peru, Albania, Romania, Lithuania, Thailand, Singapore and the United Kingdom attend such schools. In contrast, at least one in three students in Kazakhstan, Croatia, Brazil, Korea, Jordan, Tunisia and the Russian Federation attends schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by students' lack of respect for teachers to some extent or a lot.
- $69 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students skipping classes. Over 90\% of students in Indonesia, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Hong Kong-China, Macao-China, Liechtenstein, Iceland, Albania and Japan attend such schools. In contrast, at least one in two students in Croatia, the Slovak Republic, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Costa Rica, Kazakhstan, Canada, Turkey and Tunisia attends schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by this behaviour to some extent or a lot.
- $69 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students arriving late for school. Over $90 \%$ of students in Indonesia, Liechtenstein and Albania attend such schools. In contrast, at least one in two students in Tunisia, Costa Rica, Colombia, Canada, Serbia, Chile, Finland and Uruguay attends schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by this behaviour to some extent or a lot.
- $68 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by student truancy. Over $90 \%$ of students in Liechtenstein, Iceland, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, Hong Kong-China, Qatar, Singapore and Chinese Taipei attend such schools. In contrast, more than two out of three students in Serbia, Tunisia, Colombia and Montenegro attend schools where learning is hindered by student truancy to some extent or lot.
- $68 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students' disruption of classes. Over $90 \%$ of students in Japan, Romania, Indonesia, Albania, Viet Nam and Lithuania attend such schools. In contrast, more than one in two students in Liechtenstein, Brazil, Finland and Portugal attend schools where learning is hindered by this behaviour to some extent or a lot.

School principals' views of how student behaviour affects learning



As shown in Figure IV.5.6, in the countries and economies where more students reported truancy, more principals reported that student truancy hinders learning at school. For example, over $50 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Costa Rica, Chile and Uruguay reported that they had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test - a larger proportion than in most other countries and economies. In these countries, $50 \%$ of students or more attend schools whose principals reported that students arriving late hinder learning. However, there is variation here as well. In Sweden, Portugal and Bulgaria, where over $50 \%$ of students reported that they had arrived late for school, only around $30 \%$ of students are in schools whose principals reported that students' late arrival hinders learning (Table IV.5.9).

Principals' reports on the extent to which students' behaviour hinders learning often vary widely within countries and economies, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of student-related factors affecting school climate. Variations within countries and economies are smallest in Liechtenstein, Finland, Luxembourg, Germany, Viet Nam, the Netherlands, Indonesia and Norway. By contrast, in Shanghai-China and Kazakhstan there is more variation in disciplinary climate within the country/economy (Figure IV.5.5 and Table IV.5.8).

School principals were also asked to report the extent to which they believe that learning in their schools is hindered by such factors as: students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential; poor teacher-student relations; teachers having to teach students of heterogeneous ability levels within the same class; teachers having to teach students of diverse ethnic backgrounds within the same class; teachers' low expectations of students; teachers not meeting individual students' needs; teacher absenteeism; school staff resisting change; teachers being too strict with students; teacher being late for classes; and teachers not being well-prepared for classes. The responses were combined to create an index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate that has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one in OECD countries. Positive values reflect principals' perceptions that these teacher-related issues hinder learning to a lesser extent, and negative values indicate that school principals believe that these teacher-related issues hinder learning to a greater extent, compared to the OECD average.

In general, principals perceive that teachers being late for class, poor teacher-student relations, teachers not being prepared for class, and teachers being too strict with students do not hinder learning at their schools. On average across OECD countries over $90 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by one of these four behaviours (Figure IV.5.7):

- Virtually all students in Liechtenstein, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Canada, the Slovak Republic, the United Kingdom, Hungary and the United States attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers being late for class, while fewer than $70 \%$ of students in Kazakhstan, Tunisia, Shanghai-China and Uruguay attend such schools.
- Virtually all students in Montenegro, the United Kingdom, Indonesia, Lithuania, Poland and Iceland attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by poor teacher-student relations, while around $80 \%$ of students or fewer in Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China, Italy, Tunisia, Jordan, Israel and the Russian Federation attend such schools.
- Virtually all students in Hungary, Liechtenstein, the Czech Republic and Luxembourg attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers not being well-prepared for classes, while $70 \%$ of students or fewer in Kazakhstan, Shanghai-China, the Russian Federation and Jordan attend such schools.
- Nearly all students in Lithuania, Denmark, Norway, the United Kingdom and Portugal attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers being too strict with students, while two out of three students, at most, in Kazakhstan, Colombia and Thailand attend such schools.

On average across OECD countries, between $81 \%$ and $87 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teacher absenteeism, teachers' low expectations of students, or teachers having to teach students of diverse ethnic backgrounds within the same class:

- Nearly all students in Hungary, Lithuania, Korea and Portugal attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teacher absenteeism, while fewer than one in two students in Uruguay, Tunisia and Argentina attends such schools.
- Around $96 \%$ or more of students in Liechtenstein, Finland, Hungary, Switzerland, Poland and Luxembourg are in schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers' low expectations of students, while two out of three students, at most, in Kazakhstan, Tunisia, Brazil, Uruguay, Shanghai-China, Jordan and Chile attend such schools.


1. The vertical axis in the top figure refers to the percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that students arriving late for school hinders student learning "to some extent" or "a lot".
2. The horizontal axis in the top figure refers to the percentage of students who reported having arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test.
3. The vertical axis in the bottom figure refers to the percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that students skipping classes hinders student learning "to some extent" or "a lot".
4. The horizontal axis in the bottom figure refers to the percentage of students who reported having skipped some classes at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.5.1, IV.5.3 and IV.5.9.


- Around $96 \%$ of students or more in Poland, Lithuania, Korea and Japan attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers having to teach students of diverse ethnic backgrounds within the same class. By comparison, two out of three students, at most, in Luxembourg, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Greece, Austria and Malaysia attend such schools.

On average across OECD countries, between $74 \%$ and $79 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential, teachers not meeting individual students' needs, or school staff resisting change:

- Around $93 \%$ or more of students in Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, the United Kingdom, Finland, Poland and Thailand attend schools where learning is not at all or very little hindered by students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential. By comparison, fewer than one in two students in the Netherlands, Tunisia, Uruguay, the Russian Federation and Argentina attends such schools.
- Around 90\% of students or more in Indonesia, the Czech Republic, Romania, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, the Slovak Republic, Albania and Poland are in schools where learning is not at all or very little hindered by teachers not meeting individual students' needs, while in the Netherlands, Shanghai-China and Turkey, one in two students, at most, attends such schools.
- Over 90\% of students in Indonesia, Lithuania, Hungary, Viet Nam, the Czech Republic, Romania, Albania and Latvia are in schools where learning is not at all or very little hindered by school staff resisting change. By contrast, fewer than $60 \%$ of students in Italy, Colombia, Shanghai-China, the Netherlands, Argentina, Chile and France attend such schools.

Of all the indicators considered, teachers having to teach students of heterogeneous ability levels within the same class hinders learning most, according to principals. Across OECD countries on average, $45 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals reported that learning is not at all or very little hindered by this factor. More than two out of three students in the United Kingdom, Romania, New Zealand, Mexico, the United States and Ireland attend such schools, while one in four students, at most, in Hong Kong-China, Colombia, Poland, Viet Nam and Uruguay attend such schools.

Principals' reports on the extent to which teachers' behaviour hinders learning often vary widely within countries, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate. Variations within countries and economies is smallest in the Netherlands, Liechtenstein, Germany, Viet Nam, and Luxembourg and largest in Kazakhstan and Shanghai-China (Figure IV.5.7 and Table IV.5.7).

## Teacher morale

To examine the level of teacher morale in school, school principals were asked to report whether and to what extent they agree with the following statements: the morale of teachers in this school is high; teachers work with enthusiasm; teachers take pride in the school; and teachers value academic achievement. The responses were combined to create an index of teacher morale that has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one in OECD countries. Positive values indicate principals' perceptions that teacher morale is higher and negative values indicate principals' perceptions that teacher morale is lower than the OECD average.

In general, school principals reported that teachers in their schools value academic achievement, take pride in their schools, work with enthusiasm and have high morale (Figure IV.5.8). On average across OECD countries:

- $97 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals agree or strongly agree that teachers value academic achievement. Over $90 \%$ of students in all participating countries and economies except Japan attend such schools. In Japan, 76\% of students attend such schools.
- $95 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals agree or strongly agree that teachers take pride in their school. At least $90 \%$ of students in 58 participating countries and economies attend such schools, while between $82 \%$ and $89 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Greece, Turkey, Macao-China and Hong Kong-China attend such schools.
- $94 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals agree or strongly agree that teachers work with enthusiasm. At least $90 \%$ of students in 49 participating countries and economies attend such schools, while fewer than $80 \%$ of students in Tunisia, Brazil and Italy attend such schools.
- $91 \%$ of students attend schools whose principals agree or strongly agree that the morale of teachers in their schools is high. At least $90 \%$ of students in 48 participating countries and economies attend such schools, while $80 \%$ of students, at most, in Italy, Tunisia, Brazil, Spain, Portugal, Hong Kong-China, Korea and France attend such schools.

School principals' views of how teacher behaviour affects learning
Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported hindered learning "not at all" or "very little"

|  | hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K |
| - Australia | 85 | 91 | 66 | 83 | 81 | 65 | 87 | 64 | 94 | 94 | 90 |
| Austria | 86 | 94 | 33 | 65 | 85 | 81 | 80 | 73 | 88 | 85 | 93 |
| - Belgium | 82 | 97 | 42 | 76 | 92 | 84 | 75 | 66 | 86 | 91 | 87 |
| Canada | 90 | 95 | 62 | 80 | 94 | 78 | 91 | 66 | 92 | 99 | 96 |
| Chile | 54 | 88 | 29 | 89 | 66 | 68 | 75 | 57 | 86 | 79 | 73 |
| Czech Republic | 82 | 96 | 40 | 95 | 93 | 96 | 91 | 93 | 91 | 99 | 99 |
| Denmark | 86 | 97 | 61 | 88 | 91 | 86 | 85 | 84 | 99 | 95 | 97 |
| Estonia | 72 | 97 | 44 | 89 | 94 | 80 | 92 | 80 | 89 | 96 | 98 |
| Finland | 93 | 95 | 30 | 81 | 97 | 80 | 83 | 78 | 96 | 95 | 96 |
| France | 78 | 92 | 26 | 82 | 92 | 66 | 91 | 58 | 77 | 98 | 89 |
| Germany | 87 | 98 | 41 | 79 | 92 | 85 | 70 | 75 | 93 | 92 | 96 |
| Greece | 74 | 85 | 31 | 65 | 70 | 80 | 88 | 77 | 87 | 87 | 86 |
| Hungary | 71 | 93 | 38 | 88 | 96 | 86 | 99 | 95 | 92 | 99 | 100 |
| Iceland | 86 | 99 | 49 | 77 | 91 | 75 | 85 | 69 | 97 | 93 | 89 |
| Ireland | 87 | 98 | 67 | 85 | 86 | 82 | 88 | 81 | 89 | 90 | 90 |
| Israel | 75 | 79 | 45 | 83 | 79 | 73 | 74 | 79 | 86 | 83 | 82 |
| Italy | 72 | 74 | 64 | 84 | 79 | 76 | 89 | 47 | 80 | 94 | 87 |
| Japan | 72 | 90 | 28 | 96 | 80 | 74 | 97 | 69 | 81 | 93 | 87 |
| Korea | 80 | 86 | 39 | 98 | 75 | 74 | 99 | 86 | 84 | 96 | 90 |
| Luxembourg | 79 | 92 | 40 | 34 | 96 | 83 | 94 | 80 | 91 | 95 | 99 |
| Mexico | 61 | 94 | 69 | 92 | 74 | 75 | 83 | 65 | 77 | 80 | 85 |
| Netherlands | 35 | 93 | 41 | 85 | 75 | 29 | 60 | 54 | 89 | 84 | 82 |
| New Zealand | 91 | 96 | 72 | 81 | 86 | 67 | 93 | 73 | 97 | 97 | 94 |
| Norway | 75 | 90 | 30 | 76 | 82 | 56 | 70 | 74 | 99 | 87 | 94 |
| Poland | 93 | 99 | 22 | 99 | 96 | 90 | 93 | 89 | 97 | 98 | 97 |
| Portugal | 76 | 97 | 32 | 91 | 83 | 88 | 98 | 82 | 98 | 97 | 94 |
| Slovak Republic | 79 | 98 | 38 | 85 | 88 | 92 | 92 | 84 | 76 | 99 | 96 |
| Slovenia | 84 | 95 | 31 | 74 | 86 | 83 | 87 | 78 | 90 | 95 | 95 |
| Spain | 71 | 94 | 34 | 71 | 78 | 76 | 95 | 68 | 85 | 91 | 93 |
| Sweden | 79 | 93 | 55 | 70 | 81 | 74 | 79 | 79 | 97 | 97 | 92 |
| Switzerland | 89 | 98 | 44 | 56 | 96 | 87 | 95 | 75 | 94 | 98 | 98 |
| Turkey | 68 | 82 | 39 | 95 | 68 | 46 | 89 | 76 | 93 | 93 | 78 |
| United Kingdom | 93 | 100 | 86 | 95 | 95 | 81 | 84 | 85 | 99 | 99 | 96 |
| United States | 89 | 94 | 68 | 76 | 83 | 76 | 91 | 72 | 95 | 99 | 93 |
| OECD average | 79 | 93 | 45 | 81 | 85 | 76 | 87 | 74 | 90 | 93 | 92 |




| Albania | 87 | 93 | 57 | 90 | 79 | 91 | 94 | 92 | 86 | 97 | 94 |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 48 | 91 | 51 | 94 | 72 | 73 | 41 | 55 | 83 | 77 | 82 |
| Brazil | 63 | 81 | 59 | 90 | 61 | 59 | 66 | 64 | 83 | 75 | 72 |
| Bulgaria | 72 | 83 | 62 | 89 | 79 | 79 | 84 | 88 | 91 | 87 | 79 |
| Colombia | 51 | 85 | 20 | 79 | 72 | 67 | 78 | 49 | 66 | 80 | 83 |
| Costa Rica | 55 | 96 | 39 | 91 | 79 | 67 | 72 | 62 | 87 | 80 | 86 |
| Croatia | 76 | 88 | 28 | 85 | 73 | 76 | 92 | 72 | 80 | 88 | 81 |
| Hong Kong-China | 63 | 95 | 18 | 95 | 70 | 55 | 89 | 82 | 94 | 96 | 93 |
| Indonesia | 58 | 99 | 48 | 72 | 94 | 97 | 97 | 98 | 96 | 96 | 97 |
| Jordan | 72 | 77 | 45 | 71 | 64 | 70 | 57 | 65 | 75 | 75 | 70 |
| Kazakhstan | 55 | 58 | 38 | 80 | 54 | 61 | 57 | 67 | 60 | 58 | 47 |
| Latvia | 83 | 93 | 25 | 87 | 86 | 87 | 95 | 91 | 91 | 98 | 94 |
| Liechtenstein | 100 | 93 | 57 | 48 | 100 | 93 | 88 | 74 | 93 | 100 | 100 |
| Lithuania | 97 | 99 | 44 | 98 | 93 | 92 | 99 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 96 |
| Macao-China | 62 | 83 | 54 | 93 | 78 | 57 | 84 | 82 | 84 | 87 | 78 |
| Malaysia | 93 | 95 | 45 | 66 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 89 | 86 | 89 | 90 |
| Montenegro | 71 | 100 | 50 | 91 | 78 | 86 | 94 | 84 | 96 | 92 | 97 |
| Peru | 53 | 92 | 65 | 87 | 81 | 69 | 84 | 65 | 73 | 80 | 77 |
| Qatar | 92 | 90 | 50 | 73 | 84 | 85 | 89 | 86 | 92 | 93 | 93 |
| Romania | 91 | 91 | 79 | 92 | 91 | 94 | 94 | 93 | 92 | 95 | 96 |
| Russian Federation | 45 | 80 | 44 | 92 | 68 | 64 | 74 | 65 | 76 | 76 | 66 |
| Serbia | 64 | 92 | 61 | 92 | 71 | 88 | 93 | 75 | 88 | 85 | 80 |
| Shanghai-China | 51 | 66 | 35 | 78 | 63 | 43 | 65 | 50 | 74 | 69 | 55 |
| Singapore | 90 | 93 | 52 | 73 | 88 | 77 | 96 | 86 | 94 | 96 | 94 |
| Chinese Taipei | 78 | 85 | 46 | 81 | 79 | 69 | 91 | 79 | 84 | 92 | 85 |
| Thailand | 93 | 97 | 26 | 81 | 87 | 86 | 89 | 89 | 66 | 85 | 86 |
| Tunisia | 41 | 76 | 42 | 94 | 59 | 66 | 36 | 61 | 71 | 65 | 88 |
| United Arab Emirates | 79 | 84 | 61 | 76 | 80 | 73 | 80 | 76 | 82 | 87 | 83 |
| Uruguay | 45 | 86 | 25 | 93 | 63 | 63 | 35 | 66 | 89 | 70 | 70 |
| Viet Nam | 79 | 96 | 22 | 89 | 79 | 80 | 96 | 95 | 77 | 96 | 89 |



Note: Higher values on the index indicate better school climate
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.7.
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957365

- Figure IV.5.8 -

Schools' principals views of teacher morale


Note: Higher values on the index indicate higher teacher morale.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.10.
StatLink 泀ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957365

Principals' reports on the extent to which teachers' behaviour hinders learning often vary widely within countries and economies, as measured by the standard deviation of the index of teacher morale. Variations within countries and economies are smallest in Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Latvia, the Czech Republic, and Albania and largest in Tunisia (Figure IV.5.8 and Table IV.5.10).

## INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT INDICATORS AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

The seven indicators described above are, to a greater or lesser degree, inter-related at the school level. Schools with larger proportions of students who had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the assessment also tend to have larger proportions of students who had skipped a class or a day of school at least once during that period. On average across OECD countries, the correlation coefficient is 0.44 , and in 49 countries and economies, the correlation is 0.30 or higher. The relationship is particularly strong in Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Macao-China, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Belgium, Austria, Serbia and Croatia, where the correlation coefficient is 0.60 or higher (Table IV.5.11).

In virtually all school systems, schools with more negative disciplinary climates tend to have a higher incidence of student truancy (arriving late for school or skipping a day or a class). This relationship is especially strong in Croatia, Korea, Chinese Taipei, Kazakhstan, Hungary, Thailand, Slovenia, the Slovak Republic, Bulgaria and New Zealand, where the correlation between the proportion of students who had skipped a day or a class at least once in the previous two weeks and the school's average index of disciplinary climate is between -0.55 and -0.42 . In these countries and economies, there is also a strong relationship between the percentage of students who had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test and that index (correlation is between -0.50 and -0.28) (Figure IV.5.9).

The relationship between student truancy and teacher-student relations seems more complex. In 28 countries and economies, schools with more negative teacher-student relations tend to be those with larger proportions of students who skipped a day or a class. By contrast, in Liechtenstein, Uruguay, Macao-China, Bulgaria, Peru, Italy and Luxembourg, there is a weak but positive relationship between these two factors. Similarly, in 27 countries and economies, schools with more negative teacher-student relations also tend to be those where more students arrived late for school; but in Malaysia, Italy, Luxembourg, Montenegro and Macao-China, a weak and opposite relationship is observed (Figure IV.5.9).

Schools whose principals reported that teachers' behaviour negatively affects learning to a great extent also tend to be those whose principals reported that their teachers' morale is low. On average across OECD countries, the correlation coefficient between the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate and the index of teacher morale is 0.44. This relationship is particularly strong in Liechtenstein, Uruguay, Chile, the Slovak Republic, Hong Kong-China, Denmark, Mexico, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Thailand, Serbia, Costa Rica, the United States and Luxembourg, where the correlation coefficient is 0.50 or higher (Table IV.5.11).

In 45 countries and economies, schools with a student population that is predominantly socio-economically disadvantaged tend to have a more negative disciplinary climate. The correlation coefficient between the average student socio-economic status in a school and the school average index of disciplinary climate is over 0.40 in Chinese Taipei, Slovenia, Hungary, Croatia, Japan, Singapore, the United States, New Zealand and Shanghai-China. However, the opposite is observed in Tunisia, Indonesia and Viet Nam (Table IV.5.12). By contrast, the relationship between the average student socio-economic status in a school and the school average index of teacher-student relations varies, depending on the countries and economies. In 14 countries and economies, schools where students reported more positive relations with teachers are those with more advantaged student populations, while in 30 countries and economies, schools where students reported more positive relations with teachers are those with more disadvantaged student populations (Table IV.5.12).

On average across OECD countries as shown in Figure IV.5.10, school size, school location, school type, and the incidence of teacher shortage are related to a school's disciplinary climate, even after accounting for school features, such as the average socio-economic status of a school's student population, school size, school location, whether the school is public or private, and educational resources. Across OECD countries, schools with more advantaged student populations tend to have a more positive disciplinary climate; schools whose classes are larger or smaller than the national average tend to have a more positive disciplinary climate; schools located in cities tend to have a more negative disciplinary climate than schools located in towns; private schools tend to have a more positive disciplinary climate than public schools; schools whose principals reported more teacher shortage tend to have a more negative disciplinary climate; and schools with more socio-economically heterogeneous student populations tend to have a more negative disciplinary climate. On average across OECD countries, some $18 \%$ of the variation in school disciplinary climate is accounted for by these schools features (Table IV.5.13).

Figure IV．5．9－
Relationship between student truancy and school climate

|  | Correlation between： |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percentage of students who had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test（at the school level）and．．． |  | Percentage of students who had skipped a day or a class at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test（at the school level）and．．． |  |
|  | School average index of teacher－student relations | School average index of disciplinary climate | School average index of teacher－student relations | School average index of disciplinary climate |
| Croatia | －0．17 | －0．35 | －0．03 | －0．55 |
| Korea | －0．32 | －0．48 | －0．31 | －0．51 |
| Chinese Taipei | －0．19 | －0．33 | －0．22 | －0．49 |
| Kazakhstan | －0．46 | －0．47 | －0．38 | －0．49 |
| Hungary | －0．09 | －0．42 | －0．05 | －0．48 |
| Thailand | －0．03 | －0．50 | －0．03 | －0．46 |
| Slovenia | －0．23 | －0．35 | －0．19 | －0．45 |
| Slovak Republic | －0．08 | －0．37 | 0.00 | －0．44 |
| Bulgaria | 0.11 | －0．35 | 0.16 | －0．42 |
| New Zealand | －0．02 | －0．28 | －0．11 | －0．42 |
| France | 0.00 | －0．33 | －0．05 | －0．39 |
| Uruguay | －0．06 | －0．24 | 0.18 | －0．37 |
| United Arab Emirates | －0．04 | －0．24 | －0．09 | －0．37 |
| Lithuania | －0．23 | －0．29 | －0．34 | －0．37 |
| United States | －0．25 | －0．34 | －0．34 | －0．36 |
| Japan | －0．15 | －0．36 | －0．13 | －0．35 |
| Macao－China | 0.05 | －0．49 | 0.18 | －0．35 |
| Argentina | －0．02 | －0．16 | －0．03 | －0．32 |
| Belgium | 0.08 | －0．24 | 0.09 | －0．31 |
| Poland | －0．33 | －0．33 | －0．25 | －0．30 |
| Serbia | －0．01 | －0．28 | 0.09 | －0．30 |
| Shanghai－China | －0．21 | －0．44 | －0．19 | －0．29 |
| Tunisia | －0．13 | －0．17 | 0.02 | －0．28 |
| Greece | －0．29 | －0．21 | －0．20 | －0．28 |
| Switzerland | －0．30 | －0．26 | －0．37 | －0．28 |
| Russian Federation | －0．29 | －0．35 | －0．17 | －0．28 |
| Norway | －0．03 | －0．14 | －0．24 | －0．28 |
| Romania | 0.09 | －0．14 | 0.04 | －0．27 |
| Jordan | 0.02 | －0．29 | －0．07 | －0．27 |
| Costa Rica | －0．16 | －0．24 | －0．06 | －0．27 |
| Sweden | －0．13 | －0．12 | －0．13 | －0．26 |
| Montenegro | 0.06 | －0．43 | －0．08 | －0．25 |
| Iceland | －0．05 | －0．12 | －0．23 | －0．25 |
| Luxembourg | 0.10 | －0．20 | 0.08 | －0．25 |
| Portugal | －0．37 | －0．20 | －0．34 | －0．24 |
| Mexico | －0．22 | －0．13 | －0．17 | －0．22 |
| Colombia | －0．15 | －0．26 | －0．09 | －0．22 |
| Ireland | 0.07 | －0．32 | －0．06 | －0．22 |
| Peru | 0.04 | －0．09 | 0.12 | －0．22 |
| Indonesia | 0.05 | －0．12 | －0．08 | －0．22 |
| Germany | －0．06 | －0．20 | －0．03 | －0．22 |
| Chile | －0．07 | －0．29 | －0．22 | －0．21 |
| Singapore | －0．19 | －0．40 | －0．12 | －0．20 |
| Australia | －0．09 | －0．15 | －0．22 | －0．20 |
| Albania | －0．04 | －0．22 | －0．14 | －0．20 |
| Malaysia | 0.26 | －0．19 | －0．12 | －0．20 |
| Denmark | －0．06 | －0．25 | －0．06 | －0．19 |
| Italy | 0.14 | －0．21 | 0.12 | －0．18 |
| Estonia | －0．04 | －0．06 | －0．21 | －0．17 |
| United Kingdom | －0．11 | －0．07 | 0.01 | －0．16 |
| Brazil | －0．03 | －0．05 | －0．04 | －0．15 |
| Austria | －0．23 | －0．27 | －0．30 | －0．14 |
| Hong Kong－China | －0．04 | －0．17 | 0.02 | －0．13 |
| Finland | －0．13 | －0．29 | －0．20 | －0．13 |
| Canada | －0．23 | －0．13 | －0．17 | －0．12 |
| Czech Republic | －0．25 | －0．26 | －0．16 | －0．11 |
| Viet Nam | 0.02 | －0．19 | 0.09 | －0．10 |
| Latvia | －0．09 | －0．34 | －0．02 | －0．09 |
| Netherlands | －0．15 | －0．29 | －0．21 | －0．09 |
| Israel | －0．05 | 0.01 | －0．08 | －0．08 |
| Spain | －0．19 | －0．13 | 0.01 | －0．08 |
| Turkey | 0.10 | －0．29 | 0.11 | －0．01 |
| Qatar | －0．25 | －0．29 | －0．12 | －0．01 |
| Liechtenstein | 0.23 | －0．52 | 0.28 | 0.11 |
| OECD average | －0．12 | －0．24 | －0．14 | －0．25 |

[^15]- Figure IV.5.10

Relationship between disciplinary climate and various school features

|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { School in a city } \\ & \text { ( } 100000 \text { or more people) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Australia | 0.25 |  |  |  |  | 0.13 |  |  |  | -0.04 |  |  |
| Austria | 0.29 | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Belgium | 0.24 |  |  |  |  | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada |  | -0.04 | 0.002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chile | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Czech Republic | 0.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 0.31 |  |  |  |  | 0.31 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |
| Estonia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 | -0.07 |  |  |
| Finland | 0.21 |  |  |  | -0.08 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 0.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Germany | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greece | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 0.39 |  | -0.002 |  |  |  | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iceland |  | 0.02 | -0.005 | 0.11 | 0.12 |  | 0.25 | 0.04 | -0.03 | -0.04 | -0.28 |  |
| Ireland | 0.30 |  |  |  |  | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Israel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Italy | 0.31 |  |  |  | -0.10 |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Japan | 0.66 |  |  |  |  | -0.24 | 0.11 | 0.07 |  |  |  | -0.01 |
| Korea | 0.37 | -0.10 | 0.004 | -0.47 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.12 |  |  |  | -0.01 |
| Luxembourg | -0.05 |  | 0.000 | 0.09 |  | 0.13 | -0.12 | -0.07 | 0.09 | 0.02 | -0.83 | 0.01 |
| Mexico |  | 0.01 |  |  | -0.10 |  |  |  |  |  | -0.16 |  |
| Netherlands |  |  |  |  | -0.19 |  |  |  |  | -0.08 |  |  |
| New Zealand | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.10 |  | -0.49 |  |
| Poland |  | -0.12 | 0.013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Portugal |  |  |  |  | -0.16 | 0.31 |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |
| Slovak Republic | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slovenia | 0.54 |  |  |  |  | 0.10 | -0.05 |  | 0.03 | 0.05 |  | 0.00 |
| Spain | 0.11 |  |  |  |  | 0.18 |  | -0.07 | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Sweden | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switzerland |  |  |  |  | -0.16 |  |  |  |  |  | -0.35 |  |
| Turkey | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.32 |  |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OECD average | 0.21 | -0.02 | 0.001 |  | -0.04 | 0.07 |  |  |  | -0.02 | -0.12 |  |
| $\cdots$ Argentina |  | -0.06 | 0.003 |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| § Brazil |  |  |  |  |  | 0.20 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Bulgaria |  | 0.08 | -0.004 |  | -0.17 |  | 0.10 |  |  | -0.11 | -0.39 |  |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Costa Rica |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Croatia | 0.66 | 0.13 | -0.008 |  | -0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hong Kong-China |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.55 | -0.01 |
| Indonesia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.31 |  |
| Jordan | -0.23 |  |  |  |  | 0.32 |  |  |  | -0.07 | -0.59 |  |
| Kazakhstan | 0.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Latvia |  |  | 0.007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lithuania | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macao-China | 0.21 | 0.03 | -0.001 |  |  |  | -0.10 | 0.00 | -0.05 | -0.04 | -1.20 | -0.01 |
| Malaysia | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 |  | -0.01 |
| Montenegro | 0.25 | -0.06 | 0.003 | 0.02 | -0.23 |  | 0.14 | -0.02 | 0.04 | -0.04 | 1.11 | -0.01 |
| Peru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qatar | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.000 | -0.05 | -0.13 | 0.45 | 0.20 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.03 | -0.28 |  |
| Romania | 0.47 |  |  |  | -0.16 |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |
| Russian Federation | 0.30 | -0.06 | 0.003 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serbia | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |
| Shanghai-China | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Singapore | 0.34 | 0.03 | -0.001 |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.06 | -0.02 | -0.25 | 0.00 |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.46 | -0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thailand |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tunisia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.15 |  |  |  |  | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uruguay | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.44 | 0.00 |
| Viet Nam |  |  | 0.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^16]Across countries and economies, the extent to which the variation in school disciplinary climate is accounted for by these school features differs. In Macao-China, Montenegro, Qatar, Japan, Chinese Taipei, Korea and Luxembourg, 35\% or more of the variation is explained by these school features, while less than $8 \%$ of the variation is explained in Mexico, Estonia, Peru, Brazil, Finland and Poland (Table IV.5.13). In addition, depending on the country and economy, school disciplinary climate is related to a different set of school features, as shown in Figure IV.5.10.

## STUDENT AND SCHOOL FEATURES RELATED TO THE LIKELIHOOD OF STUDENTS ARRIVING LATE FOR SCHOOL

PISA 2012 results show that, in all participating countries and economies, those students who had arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the assessment were also more likely to have skipped a class or day of school at least once during the same period. On average across OECD countries, 14 out of 100 students who had not arrived late for school in the previous two weeks would have skipped a class or day of school during the same period, while 38 out of 100 students who had arrived late for school in the previous two weeks would have also skipped a class or day of school during the same period (Table IV.5.14). Since students who arrive late for school are more likely to skip a class or a day, this section focuses on "arriving late for school" and examines which students are more likely to arrive late for school and the profile of the schools that these students are more likely to attend.

As shown in Figure IV.5.11a, boys are more likely than girls to have reported that they had arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test. In Japan, Thailand, Lithuania, Chinese Taipei, Shanghai-China, Poland, Viet Nam and Iceland, boys are between $25 \%$ and $40 \%$ more likely than girls to have arrived late for school. Students with an immigrant background are more likely than students without an immigrant background to have reported that they had arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test. As shown in Figure IV.5.11b, in Austria, Brazil, Belgium, Germany, France and Spain, students with an immigrant background are between 53\% and $93 \%$ more likely than students wihout an immigrant background to have arrived late for school. In Finland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Malaysia, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Denmark and Estonia, students with an immigrant background are over 30\% more likely than students wihout an immigrant background to have arrived late for school (Table IV.5.15).

In another analysis, the various socio-economic and demographic background characteristics of students and schools (i.e. socio-economic status of students, gender, immigrant and language background, socio-economic profile of the school, school size and school location), as well as the type of school and the learning environment in the school are examined all together. On average across OECD countries, disadvantaged students, boys, and students with an immigrant background are more likely to have arrived late for school. Also, students in schools of average size (for the country or economy concerned), in schools located in cities, in schools with more negative disciplinary climates, and in schools with more negative teacher-student relations are more likely to have arrived late for school, while students in schools located in rural areas are less likely to have arrived late (Table IV.5.16).

Across countries and economies, the relationships between these student and school features and the likelihood of students arriving late vary; but, in most countries and economies, students' gender and average school disciplinary climate are consistently related to a higher likelihood of students' arriving late. In 32 countries and economies, boys are more likely to arrive late, and in 39 countries and economies students in schools with more negative disciplinary climates are more likely to arrive late for school, even after accounting for all these other student and school features (Table IV.5.16).

## TRENDS IN SCHOOL CLIMATE AND STUDENT TRUANCY SINCE PISA 2003

Overall comparisons between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 data suggest that, with the exception of a few countries and economies, student reports of teacher-student relations have improved. Comparisons also show that the disciplinary climate has improved in most of these countries and economies, and that students in 2012 are less likely to attend schools whose principal reported that student- and teacher-related factors negatively affect the learning climate.

According to students' reports, teacher-student relations improved between 2003 and 2012 in all but one country, Tunisia, where they remained stable. On average across OECD countries, the share of students who agreed or strongly agreed that they get along with most teachers increased by 12 percentage points during the period and increased by more than ten percentage points in 22 countries and economies. ${ }^{1}$ For example, on average across OECD countries, seven in ten students reported getting along well with most teachers in 2003, while more than eight in ten did so in 2012.

- Figure IV.5.11a

Students arriving late for school, by gender
Increased likelihood that boys reported having arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test


Note: Statistically significant differences between boys and girls are marked in a darker tone.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the increased likelihood of boys to arrive late with respect to girls.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.15.


Students arriving late for school, by students with and without immigrant backgrounds Increased likelihood that students with an immigrant background reported having arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test


Note: Statistically significant differences between students with and without an immigrant background are marked in a darker tone.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the increased likelihood of students with an immigrant background to arrive late with respect to students without an immigrant background.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.15.


Similar increases signalling better teacher-student relations were observed among students who reported that teachers are interested in their well-being, that teachers listen to what they have to say, that teachers will provide extra help if needed, and that teachers treat students fairly. Improvements in teacher-student relations are notable in Luxembourg, Iceland, Japan and the Russian Federation, where the likelihood of students responding favourably to all these questions increased and the index of teacher-student relations improved by at least 0.5 index points (Figure IV.5.12 and Table IV.5.17).

Disciplinary climate also shows signs of improvement on average across OECD countries and across 27 individual countries and economies. For example, on average across OECD countries, in 2003, 32\% of students reported that the teacher had to wait a long time for students to quiet down in every class or most classes; by 2012, this percentage had dropped to $28 \%$.


Notes: Statistically significant changes between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are marked in a darker tone.
Higher values on the index indicate better teacher-student relations.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable indices of teacher-student relations since 2003
Countries are ranked in descending order of the change in index of teacher-student relations (2012-2003).
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.17.


Figure IV.5.13
Change between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 in disciplinary climate


Notes: Statistically significant changes between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are marked in a darker tone.
Higher values on the index indicate better disciplinary climate.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
OECD average 2003 compares only OECD countries with comparable indices of disciplinary climate since 2003.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the change in the index of disciplinary climate (2012-2003).
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Table IV.5.18.
StatLink 勈页 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957365

As a result, the index of disciplinary climate improved by 0.14 index points. Disciplinary climate improved the most in Japan, Hong Kong-China, Luxembourg, Norway, the Czech Republic and Iceland: in these countries and economies, the increase in the index of disciplinary climate between 2003 and 2012 was significant and greater than 0.25 index points. In Japan, for example, students in 2012 were 10 percentage points more likely than students in 2003 to report that never or only in some lessons do students not listen to what the teacher says. In Luxembourg, students in 2012 were over 10 percentage points more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to report that never, or only in some lessons, is there is noise and disorder, that the teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down, or that students cannot work well. By contrast, students' reports on disciplinary climate declined in Tunisia and Germany during the period. In Germany, students in 2012 were significantly more likely to report that students do not listen to what the teacher says in every or in most mathematics lessons ( $36 \%$ so reported) than their peers were in 2003 ( $22 \%$ reported so) (Figure IV.5.13 and Table IV.5.18). See Box IV.3.3 for a description on how indices like the index of disciplinary climate are compared across PISA assessments.

Students in 2012 were less likely than students in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that teacher-related factors negatively affect learning. On average across OECD countries with comparable data, for example, students are 11 percentage points more likely to attend a school whose principal reported that teachers not meeting individual students' needs hinders learning very little or not at all. Similarly, students in 2012 were less likely to attend schools whose principal reported that teachers' low expectations of students, poor teacher-student relations or teacher absenteeism hinders learning. The decrease in the degree to which teacher-related factors negatively affect student learning is most apparent in Indonesia, Macao-China, Tunisia, Turkey and Portugal, where the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate increased the most, by more than 0.75 points, between 2003 and 2012. By contrast, in Belgium and the Slovak Republic teacher-related factors hindered learning more in 2012 than in 2003 as the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate fell during the period (Table IV.5.19).

Similarly, students in 2012 were also less likely to attend schools whose principal reported that there are more studentrelated factors that hinder learning. On average across OECD countries with comparable data, students in 2012 were eight percentage points more likely than their peers in 2003 to attend schools whose principal reported that the disruption of classes by students hinders learning very little or not at all. The decrease in reports that student-related factors hinder learning is most pronounced in Indonesia, Macao-China, the Russian Federation and Liechtenstein, where the index of student-related factors affecting school climate increased by more than 0.75 points. By contrast, student-related factors that affect the learning climate seem to have declined, as scores on the index of student-related factors affecting school climate fell significantly - indicating worse learning environments - in Korea, Uruguay, Belgium, the Slovak Republic and Finland (Table IV.5.20).

Consistent with the above-mentioned general trend towards more favourable learning environments, on average across OECD countries, students in 2012 were slightly less likely to report that they had arrived late for school than students were in 2003. In 15 countries and economies, fewer students in 2012 than in 2003 reported that they had arrived late in the two weeks prior to the PISA test. Improvements in punctuality are most marked in the Netherlands and Iceland, where the percentage of students who reported that they had not arrived late increased by 14 and 11 percentage points, respectively. The incidence of tardiness increased, however, in nine countries and economies, particularly in Turkey and Tunisia, where the percentage of students who reported that they had arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the test increased by more than 10 percentage points over the period. In Turkey, for example, $27 \%$ of students in 2003 reported that they had arrived late at least once in the previous two weeks, while in 2012, 44\% of students reported so (Table IV.5.22).

In both Tunisia and Turkey, as well as in Latvia, Sweden, Uruguay, Poland and the Russian Federation, the share of students attending schools where the majority of students reported that they had arrived late increased by more than 10 percentage points between 2003 and 2012, thus showing an increase in the concentration of late-arriving students in particular schools (Table IV.5.23).

## Note

1. This average trend corresponds to OECD countries with comparable data in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. Other global averages reported in this section also correspond to the average across OECD countries with comparable data in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. Although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 included questions referring to the learning climate, not all indicators have comparable data. In 2003, for example, questionnaires did not include questions on student truancy, skipping school. Thus, it is not possible to observe trends for these indicators.
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## Policy Implications of School Management and Practices

In the wake of the recent global economic crisis, countries need to structure and manage school systems efficiently to maximise limited resources. This chapter considers how policies related to the governance of school systems and the learning environment in individual schools are associated with performance in PISA and equity at the country/economy and school levels.

The impact of the recent economic crisis on education budgets has only just begun to be observed; but it is evident that, in the context of the crisis, countries need to structure and manage school systems efficiently to maximise limited resources. However, as this volume shows, when it comes to education, money isn't everything. Performance in mathematics, reading and science is less related to a country's/economy's income or expenditure on education per student than to how those educational resources are allocated, and to the policies, practices and learning environments that determine the conditions in which students can work to achieve their full potential.

PISA conducts extensive, rigorous and internationally comparable assessments to measure the knowledge and skills of 15 -year-old students. The purpose of the assessments is to inform policy makers and educators on the degree to which their students are prepared for life. Because PISA reports on the achievements of many countries and economies against a common set of benchmarks, it stimulates discussion within participating countries and economies about their education policies, with citizens recognising that their country's/economy's performance in education must be better-than-average if their children want better jobs and better lives. PISA informs this discussion by collecting reliable data on students' ability to apply high levels of knowledge and highly complex thinking to real-world problems. The PISA survey also gathers a wide range of background data about the students.

This volume makes the link between these two bodies of data, with the aim of associating patterns of students performance with a wide variety of background data, such as how much teachers are paid, the degree to which decisions are devolved from higher authorities to the school faculty, the nature of the assessments that students must take, how educational resources are allocated across schools, and whether the school climate is conducive to learning, to cite a few. In this way, while the causal nature of such relationships cannot be established, an extensive network of correlations can be drawn between certain dimensions of student performance and a large range of factors that could conceivably affect student performance. The intent of this volume is not to specify a formula for success; this volume does not contain policy prescriptions. Rather, the objective is to provide a resource for decision making. Education is highly value-laden. School systems tend to reflect the values and preferences of parents, students, administrators, politicians and/or many others. Yet such values and preferences evolve over time and education systems must change to accommodate them. Decision makers in domain of education can benefit from benchmarking research, learning about the range of factors that is related to success, taking inspiration from the success of others, and then adapting policies and practices to the local context while adding unique elements that make their own school system one of a kind.

## ENSURE THAT THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IS CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING FOR ALL...

PISA shows that students tend to perform better in schools that provide an environment conducive to learning; it also shows that socio-economically disadvantaged students are less likely to be in orderly classrooms than advantaged students. However, even after accounting for the socio-economic status of schools and students, schools with less incidence of student truancy or better disciplinary climate tend to perform better.

In other words, students perform better in schools with a better school climate, partly because such schools tend to have more students from advantaged backgrounds who generally perform well, partly because this favourable socio-economic characteristic of students reinforces a climate conducive to learning, and partly for reasons unrelated to socio-economic factors. To the extent that improved disciplinary climate can be considered a pre-condition for improved student performance, these inter-relationships highlight how important it is to attract the most talented teachers into the most challenging classrooms, and to ensure that children from all socio-economic backgrounds are learning in a positive disciplinary climate.

Assessments and information systems, already in place in most countries ad economies, can be used to identify individual schools that need special assistance. Poland (Box IV.2.1), Mexico (Box II.2.4) and Colombia (Box IV.4.3), for example, have improved the information infrastructure of their education systems so that they can better identify and support struggling schools.

## ...AND OFFER SUPPORT TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN QUALIFIED TEACHERS.

It is encouraging, though, that learning environments have generally improved between 2003 and 2012, even if there are still schools with poor learning environments in all countries and economies. What kinds of interventions are most effective for these schools? PISA results show that, when comparing two schools, public or private, of the same size, in the same kind of location, and whose students share similar socio-economic status, disciplinary climate tends to be better in the school that does not suffer from a shortage of qualified teachers. Teacher shortage and disciplinary climate are inter-related. The nature of that relationship cannot be discerned from these data; for example, teachers may avoid
schools with more disciplinary problems, or a shortage of qualified teachers can adversely affect disciplinary climate. Whatever the case, public policy needs to break this vicious cycle. The fact that these inter-relationships are far weaker in some countries and economies than in others shows that this can be done.

The quality of a school cannot exceed the quality of its teachers and principals. Governments, like corporations, should know what is required to build an effective workforce: a pool of talented people from which to recruit new employees; a fair and rigorous recruitment process; initial and continuing training; adequate compensation; rewards for the best performers, support for those who need improvement, and ways of encouraging those who cannot or do not improve to leave the profession.

In building an effective teaching force, the true test always comes when these commitments are weighed against others. How do countries and economies pay teachers compared to the way they pay others with the same level of education? How are education credentials compared with other qualifications when people are being considered for jobs? Would most adults want their child to be a teacher? Does the media - and the public in general - show interest in schools and schooling? When it comes down to it, which matters more: a community's standing in the sports leagues or its standing in the student academic achievement league tables? Are parents more likely to encourage their children to study longer and harder? In effect, the answers to these questions show the extent to which a society values education.

Interestingly, countries that have improved their performance in PISA, like Estonia (Box I.5.1), Poland (Box IV.2.1), Brazil (Box I.2.4), Colombia (Box IV.4.3), Japan (Box III.3.1) and Israel (Box IV.1.4) for example, have established policies to improve the quality of their teaching staff by either adding to the requirements to earn a teaching license, providing incentives for high-achieving students to enter the profession, increasing salaries to make the profession more attractive and to retain more teachers, or by offering incentives for teachers to engage in in-service teacher-training programmes. While paying teachers well is only part of the equation, higher salaries can help school systems to attract the best candidates to the teaching profession. PISA results show that high-performing countries tend to pay more to teachers relative to their per capita GDP.

School systems also need to ensure that teachers are allocated to schools and students where they can make the most difference. Systems could re-examine teacher hiring/allocation systems to ensure that difficult schools get enough qualified teachers, develop incentive systems to attract qualified teachers in these difficult schools, and ensure that teachers in difficult schools participate in in-service training (results show that these teachers are less likely to participate in professional training).

## SUPPORT SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS...

The analyses in this volume show that schools with more socio-economically disadvantaged students tend to have lowerquality resources than schools with more advantaged students. Fairness in resource allocation is not only important for equity in education, but it is also related to the performance of the education system as a whole. The results show that school systems with high student performance in mathematics tend to allocate resources more equitably between advantaged and disadvantaged schools. In these systems, there are smaller differences between higher-performing and lower-performing schools in principals' reports on teacher shortage, the adequacy of educational resources and physical infrastructure, and smaller differences in average mathematics learning time between schools with more advantaged and those with more disadvantaged students.

For example, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Korea and Slovenia all show higher-than-OECD average performance in mathematics. In these countries, principals in disadvantaged schools tended to report that their schools had adequate educational resources as much as, if not more than, principals in advantaged schools reported.

## ...BY USING APPROPRIATE APPROACHES, DEPENDING ON THE OVERALL LEVEL OF RESOURCES...

As might be expected, in systems where the overall level of educational resources is below the OECD average, there tends to be a greater gap in educational resources between advantaged and disadvantaged schools. Scarce resources tend to be more concentrated in advantaged schools, and disadvantaged schools tend to suffer from inadequacy or shortage of resources. The overall level of resources is also clearly linked to overall performance.

In contrast, among systems where the overall level of educational resources is above the OECD average, neither student performance nor equity in resource allocation is linked to the overall level of resources. In these cases, the challenge is to allocate resources efficiently and equitably.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT AND PRACTICES

## ...AND SUPPORT DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS AS WELL.

PISA shows that, in nearly all participating countries and economies, students who had attended pre-primary school tend to perform better at the age of 15 than students who had not attended, even after accounting for students' socioeconomic status. PISA also shows how enrolment in pre-primary education changed over time. Fifteen-year-old students in 2012 were more likely than 15 -year-olds in 2003 to have attended at least one year of pre-primary education. But the rate of increase in pre-primary enrolment is higher among advantaged students than disadvantaged students, which means that the socio-economic gap between students who had attended pre-primary education and those who had not has widened over time. Policies that ensure that disadvantaged students and families have access to highquality pre-primary education and care can help reverse that trend. It is important to provide information and guidance for parents to increase enrolment in pre-primary education for all children, regardless of their socio-economic status. Governments should ensure that quality pre-primary education is available locally, especially when disadvantaged families are concentrated in certain geographic areas. Governments should also develop fair and efficient mechanisms for subsidising pre-primary education to ease the financial burden on families.

Israel (Box IV.1.4), Germany (Box II.3.2), Mexico (Box II.2.4), Turkey (Box I.2.5) and Brazil (Box I.2.4) have recently implemented targeted policies to improve the performance of low-achieving schools or students, or have distributed more resources to those regions and schools that need them most. Considering the importance of equity in resource allocation, the OECD has launched a new project ${ }^{1}$ on this issue and more detailed information on how some high-performing countries allocate resources will be available as of 2015.

## BALANCE PROFESSIONAL AUTONOMY WITH A COLLABORATIVE CULTURE AMONG SCHOOL STAFF.

In recent years, many school systems have been redefining school leadership roles to drive improvements in learning outcomes and to manage greater school autonomy and accountability. This comes at a time when increased decentralisation in many countries is being coupled with more school autonomy, more accountability for school and student results, better use of education theory and pedagogical processes, and broader responsibility for supporting schools' local communities, other schools and other public services. This marks a shift from Tayloristic management paradigms towards the kinds of paradigms that are more suited to managing professionals or "knowledge workers". In the former, one typically sees bureaucratic "command-and-control" systems that leave little discretion to the workers and supervisors on the factory floor or service-delivery level of the organisation. In the latter, the people responsible for actually making the product or delivering the services have much more control over the way resources are used, people are deployed, the work is organised and how the work gets done.

PISA results show that in higher-performing systems, schools have more autonomy, with incentives and the capacity to improve. In the school systems of Hong Kong-China, Japan, the Netherlands and Korea, for example, schools have more responsibility for establishing student disciplinary policies, student assessment policies, approving students for admission to the school, and choosing which textbooks are used and which courses are offered.

A stand-alone policy to grant schools greater autonomy, however, will not, in itself, result in better outcomes. Schools with more autonomy tend to perform better than schools with less autonomy when the school system, as a whole, uses such accountability arrangements as setting clear objectives of what students are expected to learn and sharing information about outcomes, and/or when principals and teachers work together to manage schools. Some countries, like Colombia (Box IV.4.3), Poland (Box IV.2.1) and Korea (Box I.4.1) have given schools and local authorities more autonomy and have recognised that autonomy works only in the context of collaboration and accountability. Others, like Portugal (Box III.4.1), have reshaped the organisation of schools to facilitate collaboration and economies of scale among individual schools by creating school clusters. These countries' approaches to autonomy suggest that it is the combination of various conditions, rather than a single policy in isolation, that is related to better outcomes.

## RECOGNISE THAT THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY RESPOND TO MARKET MECHANISMS.

In contrast, some features, most notably the prevalence of private schools and competition for students, have no discernible relationship with student performance, at least at the system level. Socio-economically advantaged students, who tend to achieve higher scores, are also more likely to attend private schools and schools that compete for enrolment. Thus, after socio-economic status is accounted for, private schools do not perform better than public schools; and schools that compete with other schools for students do not perform better than schools that don't compete.

Although individual parents may derive an advantage for their child from the privileged socio-economic context - and attendant resources - of private schools, school systems as a whole do not seem to benefit from a greater prevalence of private schools or a higher degree of competition among schools.

In fact, school competition is a multi-faceted concept. Principals' perceptions of school competition is not necessary the same as that of the parents of students in their schools. More worryingly, in the countries and economies that administered the PISA parent questionnaire, disadvantaged parents are significantly more likely than advantaged parents to report that they considered "low expenses" and "financial aid" to be very important factors to consider when choosing a school. While parents from all backgrounds cite academic achievement as an important consideration when choosing a school for their children, advantaged parents are, on average, nine percentage points more likely than disadvantaged parents to cite this criterion as "very important". These differences suggest that disadvantaged parents may believe that their choice of schools for their child is limited, due to the cost of some schools. If children from disadvantaged backgrounds cannot attend high-performing schools because of financial constraints, then school systems that offer parents more choice of schools for their children will necessarily be less effective in improving the performance of all students.

## PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL STUDENTS...

PISA 2012 results, like those of earlier PISA assessments, show that, in general, school systems that cater to different students' needs by separating students into different institutions, grade levels and classes, known as stratification, have not succeeded in producing superior overall results, and in some cases they have lower-than-average and more inequitable performance. For example, cross-country/economy analysis shows that in the systems where more students repeat a grade, the impact of students' socio-economic status on their performance is stronger. Students in schools where no ability grouping is practiced also scored eight points higher in mathematics in 2012 compared to their counterparts in 2003, while students in schools where ability grouping is practiced in some or all classes had lower scores in PISA 2012 than their counterparts in PISA 2003.

In highly stratified systems, there may be more incentives for schools to select the best students, and fewer incentives to support difficult students if there is an option of transferring them to other schools. In contrast, in comprehensive systems, schools must find ways of working with students from across the performance spectrum. These different incentive systems may help explain the greater level of equity achieved in systems that use stratification less. School systems that continue to differentiate among students in these ways need to create appropriate incentives to ensure that some students are not "discarded" by the system.

Reflecting these results, Poland (Box IV.2.1), for example, reformed its school system by delaying the age of selection into different programmes; and schools in Germany (Box II.3.2) are also moving towards reducing the levels of stratification across education programmes.

## ...AND MOTIVATE STUDENTS.

The PISA 2012 results also show that students in more comprehensive systems reported that making an effort in mathematics and learning mathematics is important for their future career. This does not necessarily mean that if stratification policies were changed, students in stratified systems would have better instrumental motivation to learn, since PISA does not measure cause and effect. However, policy makers in highly stratified systems need to consider not only the equity aspect of education outcomes but also non-cognitive outcomes, such as students' attitudes towards learning.

## ENGAGE STUDENTS IN SCHOOL EVALUATION AND TEACHER APPRAISAL TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING.

Compared with PISA 2003, more schools are using student assessments to compare the school's performance to that of other schools or use student assessment data to monitor teacher practice. The scope of evaluations and assessments is not only limited to student assessments, but most schools use various forms of evaluations, such as self-evaluations, external school evaluation and teacher appraisals. PISA shows that, on average across OECD countries, 92\% of students are in schools that use at least a self-evaluation or external evaluation to assure and improve school quality, and $60 \%$ of students are in schools that seek written feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources in addition to using self-evaluations and/or external evaluations of the school. PISA results also show that in systems that attain a high level of equity, more schools tend to seek written feedback from students regarding lessons, teachers or resources.

The OECD review on evaluation and assessment in education (OECD, 2013) emphasises the importance of engaging all staff and students in school self-evaluations and using student feedback to teachers for formative purpose. Some countries engage students in school evaluations by establishing student councils or conducting student surveys in schools. In order to use the feedback from students effectively, school staff may need assistance in interpreting the evaluative information and translating it into action. Trust among school staff and students, and strong commitment from the school community, is key to making this practice work.

## APPLY A COHESIVE, SYSTEMATIC AND CONTINUOUS APPROACH TO IMPROVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

Since education policies and practices, resources invested in education, the learning environment, socio-economic status, the demographic profile of schools and education outcomes are all interrelated, a cohesive and systematic approach is needed. In addition, since school systems change over time, intentionally or not, in response to external factors, efforts to improve school systems should be continuous. Korea (Box I.4.1), Turkey (Box I.2.5), Colombia (Box IV.4.3), Estonia (Box I.5.1) and Japan (Box III.3.1), among others, have established strategic development plans. These frameworks anticipate challenges (e.g. demographic changes) and provide guidance for coherent policies and programmes to be implemented at different levels of education. In most cases, they are flexible enough to allow for revisions and to be adapted to local contexts. What PISA findings tell policy makers, in the end, is that while there are several features that are shared among high-performing systems, among systems with greater equity or among high-performing schools, no one policy or practice spells success.

## Note

1. The name of the project is OECD review of policies to improve the effectiveness of resource use in schools (school resources review).
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## Notes regarding Cyprus

Note by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".
Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

## A note regarding Israel

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.
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 AND PARENT CONTEXT QUESTIONNAIRES}

## How the PISA 2012 mathematics assessments were designed, analysed and scaled

The development of the PISA 2012 mathematics tasks was co-ordinated by an international consortium of educational research institutions contracted by the OECD, under the guidance of a group of mathematics experts from participating countries. Participating countries contributed stimulus material and questions, which were reviewed, tried out and refined iteratively over the three years leading up to the administration of the assessment in 2012. The development process involved provisions for several rounds of commentary from participating countries and economies, as well as small-scale piloting and a formal field trial in which samples of 15-year-olds (about 1000 students) from participating countries and economies took part. The mathematics expert group recommended the final selection of tasks, which included material submitted by participating countries and economies. The selection was made with regard to both their technical quality, assessed on the basis of their performance in the field trial, and their cultural appropriateness and interest level for 15 -year-olds, as judged by the participating countries. Another essential criterion for selecting the set of material as a whole was its fit to the framework described in Volume 1, in order to maintain the balance across various categories of context, content and process. Finally, it was carefully ensured that the set of questions covered a range of difficulty, allowing good measurement and description of the mathematics literacy of all 15-year-old students, from the least proficient to the highly able.

More than 110 print mathematics questions were used in PISA 2012, but each student in the sample only saw a fraction of the total pool because different sets of questions were given to different students. The mathematics questions selected for inclusion in PISA 2012 were organised into half-hour clusters. These, along with clusters of reading and science questions, were assembled into booklets containing four clusters each. Each participating student was then given a two-hour assessment. As mathematics was the focus of the PISA 2012 assessment, every booklet included at least one cluster of mathematics material. The clusters were rotated so that each cluster appeared in each of the four possible positions in the booklets, and each pair of clusters appeared in at least one of the 13 booklets that were used.

This design, similar to those used in previous PISA assessments, makes it possible to construct a single scale of mathematics proficiency, in which each question is associated with a particular point on the scale that indicates its difficulty, whereby each student's performance is associated with a particular point on the same scale that indicates his or her estimated proficiency. A description of the modelling technique used to construct this scale can be found in the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

The relative difficulty of tasks in a test is estimated by considering the proportion of test takers who answer each question correctly. The relative proficiency of students taking a particular test can be estimated by considering the proportion of test questions they answer correctly. A single continuous scale shows the relationship between the difficulty of questions and the proficiency of students. By constructing a scale that shows the difficulty of each question, it is possible to locate the level of mathematics literacy that the question represents. By showing the proficiency of each student on the same scale, it is possible to describe the level of mathematics literacy that the student possesses.

The location of student proficiency on this scale is set in relation to the particular group of questions used in the assessment. However, just as the sample of students taking PISA in 2012 is drawn to represent all the 15 -year-olds in the participating countries and economies, so the individual questions used in the assessment are designed to represent the definition of mathematics literacy adequately. Estimates of student proficiency reflect the kinds of tasks they would be expected to perform successfully. This means that students are likely to be able to complete questions successfully at or below the difficulty level associated with their own position on the scale (but they may not always do so). Conversely, they are unlikely to be able to successfully complete questions above the difficulty level associated with their position on the scale (but they may sometimes do so).

The further a student's proficiency is located above a given question, the more likely he or she is to successfully complete the question (and other questions of similar difficulty); the further the student's proficiency is located below a given question, the lower the probability that the student will be able to successfully complete the question, and other questions of similar difficulty.

## How mathematics proficiency levels are defined in PISA 2012

PISA 2012 provides an overall mathematics literacy scale, drawing on all the questions in the mathematics assessment, as well as scales for three process and four content categories. The metric for the overall mathematics scale is based on a mean for OECD countries set at 500 in PISA 2003, with a standard deviation of 100. To help interpret what students' scores mean in substantive terms, the scale is divided into levels, based on a set of statistical principles, and then descriptions are generated, based on the tasks that are located within each level, to describe the kinds of skills and knowledge needed to successfully complete those tasks.

For PISA 2012, the range of difficulty of tasks allows for the description of six levels of mathematics proficiency: Level 1 is the lowest described level, then Level 2, Level 3 and so on up to Level 6.

Students with a proficiency within the range of Level 1 are likely to be able to successfully complete Level 1 tasks (and others like them), but are unlikely to be able to complete tasks at higher levels. Level 6 reflects tasks that present the greatest challenge in terms
of mathematics skills and knowledge. Students with scores in this range are likely to be able to complete mathematics tasks located at that level successfully, as well as all the other mathematics tasks in PISA.

PISA applies a standard methodology for constructing proficiency scales. Based on a student's performance on the tasks in the test, his or her score is generated and located in a specific part of the scale, thus allowing the score to be associated with a defined proficiency level. The level at which the student's score is located is the highest level for which he or she would be expected to answer correctly most of a random selection of questions within the same level. Thus, for example, in an assessment composed of tasks spread uniformly across Level 3, students with a score located within Level 3 would be expected to complete at least $50 \%$ of the tasks successfully. Because a level covers a range of difficulty and proficiency, success rates across the band vary. Students near the bottom of the level would be likely to succeed on just over $50 \%$ of the tasks spread uniformly across the level, while students at the top of the level would be likely to succeed on well over $70 \%$ of the same tasks.

Figure I.2.21 in Volume I provides details of the nature of mathematics skills, knowledge and understanding required at each level of the mathematics scale.

## Context questionnaire indices

This section explains the indices derived from the student and school context questionnaires used in PISA 2012.
Several PISA measures reflect indices that summarise responses from students, their parents or school representatives (typically principals) to a series of related questions. The questions were selected from a larger pool of questions on the basis of theoretical considerations and previous research. The PISA 2012 Assessment and Analytical Framework (OECD, 2013) provides an in-depth description of this conceptual framework. Structural equation modelling was used to confirm the theoretically expected behaviour of the indices and to validate their comparability across countries and economies. For this purpose, a model was estimated separately for each country and collectively for all OECD countries. For a detailed description of other PISA indices and details on the methods, see PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

There are two types of indices: simple indices and scale indices.
Simple indices are the variables that are constructed through the arithmetic transformation or recoding of one or more items, in exactly the same way across assessments. Here, item responses are used to calculate meaningful variables, such as the recoding of the four-digit ISCO-08 codes into "Highest parents' socio-economic index (HISEI)" or, teacher-student ratio based on information from the school questionnaire.

Scale indices are the variables constructed through the scaling of multiple items. Unless otherwise indicated, the index was scaled using a weighted likelihood estimate (WLE) (Warm, 1989), using a one-parameter item response model (a partial credit model was used in the case of items with more than two categories). For details on how each scale index was constructed see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming). In general, the scaling was done in three stages:

- The item parameters were estimated from equal-sized subsamples of students from all participating countries and economies.
- The estimates were computed for all students and all schools by anchoring the item parameters obtained in the preceding step.
- The indices were then standardised so that the mean of the index value for the OECD student population was zero and the standard deviation was one (countries being given equal weight in the standardisation process).

Sequential codes were assigned to the different response categories of the questions in the sequence in which the latter appeared in the student, school or parent questionnaires. Where indicated in this section, these codes were inverted for the purpose of constructing indices or scales. Negative values for an index do not necessarily imply that students responded negatively to the underlying questions. A negative value merely indicates that the respondents answered less positively than all respondents did on average across OECD countries. Likewise, a positive value on an index indicates that the respondents answered more favourably, or more positively, than respondents did, on average, across OECD countries. Terms enclosed in brackets $<>$ in the following descriptions were replaced in the national versions of the student, school and parent questionnaires by the appropriate national equivalent. For example, the term <qualification at ISCED level 5A> was translated in the United States into "Bachelor's degree, post-graduate certificate program, Master's degree program or first professional degree program". Similarly the term <classes in the language of assessment> in Luxembourg was translated into "German classes" or "French classes" depending on whether students received the German or French version of the assessment instruments.

In addition to simple and scaled indices described in this annex, there are a number of variables from the questionnaires that correspond to single items not used to construct indices. These non-recoded variables have prefix of "ST" for the questionnaire items in the student questionnaire, "SC" for the items in the school questionnaire, and " $\mathrm{PA}^{\prime}$ " for the items in the parent questionnaire. All the context questionnaires as well as the PISA international database, including all variables, are available through www.pisa.oecd.org.

## Scaling of questionnaire indices for trend analyses

In PISA, to gather information about students' and schools' characteristics, both students and schools complete a background questionnaire. In PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 several questions were kept untouched, enabling the comparison of responses to these
questions over time. In this report, only questions that maintained an exact wording are used for trends analyses. Questions with subtle word changes or questions with major word changes were not compared across time because it is impossible to discern whether observed changes in the response are due to changes in the construct they are measuring or to changes in the way the construct is being measured.

Also, in PISA, as described in this Annex, questionnaire items are used to construct indices. Whenever the questions used in the construction of indices remains intact in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, the corresponding indices are compared. Two types of indices are used in PISA: simple indices and scale indices.

Simple indices recode a set of responses to questionnaire items. For trends analyses, the values observed in PISA 2003 are compared directly to PISA 2012, just as simple responses to questionnaire items are. This is the case of indices like student-teacher ratio and ability grouping in mathematics.

Scale indices, on the other hand, imply WLE estimates which require rescaling in order to be comparable across PISA cycles. Scale indices, like the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status, the index of sense of belonging, the index of attitudes towards school, the index of intrinsic motivation to learn mathematics, the index of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics, the index of mathematics self-efficacy, the index of mathematics self-concept, the index of anxiety towards mathematics, the index of teacher shortage, the index of quality of physical infrastructure, the index of quality of educational resources, the index of disciplinary climate, the index of teacher-student relations, the index of teacher morale, the index of student-related factors affecting school climate and the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate, were scaled, in PISA 2012 to have an OECD average of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 , on average, across OECD countries. These same scales were scaled, in PISA 2003, to have an OECD average of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. Because they are on different scales, values reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) cannot be compared with those reported in this volume. To make these scale indices comparable, values for 2003 have been rescaled to the 2012 scale, using the PISA 2012 parameter estimates.

These re-scaled indices are available at www.pisa.oecd.org. They can be merged to the corresponding PISA 2003 dataset using the country names, school and student-level identifiers. The rescaled PISA index of economic, social and cultural status is also available to be merged with the PISA 2000, PISA 2006 and PISA 2009 dataset.

## Student-level simple indices

## Age

The variable AGE is calculated as the difference between the middle month and the year in which students were assessed and their month and year of birth, expressed in years and months.

## Study programme

In PISA 2012, study programmes available to 15 -year-old students in each country were collected both through the student tracking form and the student questionnaire (ST02). All study programmes were classified using ISCED (OECD, 1999). In the PISA international database, all national programmes are indicated in a variable (PROGN) where the first six digits refer to the national centre code and the last two digits to the national study programme code.

The following internationally comparable indices were derived from the data on study programmes:

- Programme level (ISCEDL) indicates whether students are (1) primary education level (ISCED 1); (2) lower-secondary education level; or (3) upper secondary education level.
- Programme designation (ISCEDD) indicates the designation of the study programme: (1) " A " (general programmes designed to give access to the next programme level); (2) "B" (programmes designed to give access to vocational studies at the next programme level); (3) "C" (programmes designed to give direct access to the labour market); or (4) " M " (modular programmes that combine any or all of these characteristics).
- Programme orientation (ISCEDO) indicates whether the programme's curricular content is (1) general; (2) pre-vocational; (3) vocational; or (4) modular programmes that combine any or all of these characteristics.


## Occupational status of parents

Occupational data for both a student's father and a student's mother were obtained by asking open-ended questions in the student questionnaire (ST12, ST16). The responses were coded to four-digit ISCO codes (ILO, 1990) and then mapped to the SEI index of Ganzeboom et al. (1992). Higher scores of SEI indicate higher levels of occupational status. The following three indices are obtained:

- Mother's occupational status (OCOD1).
- Father's occupational status (OCOD2).
- The highest occupational level of parents (HISEI) corresponds to the higher SEI score of either parent or to the only available parent's SEI score.
[Part 1/1]
Table A1.1 Levels of parental education converted into years of schooling


1. In Belgium the distinction between universities and other tertiary schools doesn't match the distinction between ISCED 5A and ISCED 5B.
2. In the Slovak Republic, university education (ISCED 5A) usually lasts five years and doctoral studies (ISCED 6) lasts three more years. Therefore, university graduates will have completed 18 years of study and graduates of doctoral programmes will have completed 21 years of study.
Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database
StatLink 可ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932937073

Some of the analyses distinguish between four different categories of occupations by the major groups identified by the ISCO coding of the highest parental occupation: Elementary (ISCO 9), semi-skilled blue-collar (ISCO 6, 7 and 8), semi-skilled white-collar (ISCO 4 and 5), skilled (ISCO 1, 2 and 3). This classification follows the same methodology used in other OECD publications such as Education at a Glance (2013b) and the OECD Skills Outlook (2013c). ${ }^{1}$

## Educational level of parents

The educational level of parents is classified using ISCED (OECD, 1999) based on students' responses in the student questionnaire (ST13, ST14, ST17 and ST18).

As in PISA 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009, indices were constructed by selecting the highest level for each parent and then assigning them to the following categories: (0) None, (1) ISCED 1 (primary education), (2) ISCED 2 (lower secondary), (3) ISCED level 3B or 3C (vocational/pre-vocational upper secondary), (4) ISCED 3A (upper secondary) and/or ISCED 4 (non-tertiary post-secondary), (5) ISCED 5B (vocational tertiary), (6) ISCED 5A, 6 (theoretically oriented tertiary and post-graduate). The following three indices with these categories are developed:

- Mother's educational level (MISCED).
- Father's educational level (FISCED).
- Highest educational level of parents (HISCED) corresponds to the higher ISCED level of either parent.

Highest educational level of parents was also converted into the number of years of schooling (PARED). For the conversion of level of education into years of schooling, see Table A1.1.

## Immigration and language background

Information on the country of birth of students and their parents is collected in a similar manner as in PISA 2000, PISA 2003, PISA 2006 and PISA 2009 by using nationally specific ISO coded variables. The ISO codes of the country of birth for students and their parents are available in the PISA international database (COBN_S, COBN_M, and COBN_F).

The index on immigrant background (IMMIG) has the following categories: (1) non-immigrant students (those students born in the country of assessment, or those with at least one parent born in that country; students who were born abroad with at least one parent born in the country of assessment are also classified as non-immigrant students), (2) second-generation students (those born in the country of assessment but whose parents were born in another country) and (3) first-generation students (those born outside the country of assessment and whose parents were also born in another country). Students with missing responses for either the student or for both parents, or for all three questions have been given missing values for this variable.

Students indicate the language they usually speak at home. The data are captured in nationally-specific language codes, which were recoded into variable LANGN with the following two values: (1) language at home is the same as the language of assessment, and (2) language at home is a different language than the language of assessment.

## Relative grade

Data on the student's grade are obtained both from the student questionnaire (ST01) and from the student tracking form. As with all variables that are on both the tracking form and the questionnaire, inconsistencies between the two sources are reviewed and resolved during data-cleaning. In order to capture between-country variation, the relative grade index (GRADE) indicates whether students are at the modal grade in a country (value of 0 ), or whether they are below or above the modal grade level ( +x grades, -x grades).

The relationship between the grade and student performance was estimated through a multilevel model accounting for the following background variables: i) the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status; ii) the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status squared; iii) the school mean of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status; iv) an indicator as to whether students were foreign-born first-generation students; $v$ ) the percentage of first-generation students in the school; and vi) students' gender.

Table A1.2 presents the results of the multilevel model. Column 1 in Table A1.2 estimates the score-point difference that is associated with one grade level (or school year). This difference can be estimated for the 32 OECD countries in which a sizeable number of 15 -year-olds in the PISA samples were enrolled in at least two different grades. Since 15-year-olds cannot be assumed to be distributed at random across the grade levels, adjustments had to be made for the above-mentioned contextual factors that may relate to the assignment of students to the different grade levels. These adjustments are documented in columns 2 to 7 of the table. While it is possible to estimate the typical performance difference among students in two adjacent grades net of the effects of selection and contextual factors, this difference cannot automatically be equated with the progress that students have made over the last school year but should be interpreted as a lower boundary of the progress achieved. This is not only because different students were assessed but also because the content of the PISA assessment was not expressly designed to match what students had learned in the preceding school year but more broadly to assess the cumulative outcome of learning in school up to age 15. For example, if the curriculum of the grades in which 15-year-olds are enrolled mainly includes material other than that assessed by PISA (which, in turn, may have been included in earlier school years) then the observed performance difference will underestimate student progress.
[Part 1/1]
Table A1.2 A multilevel model to estimate grade effects in mathematics accounting for some background variables

|  |  | Multilevel model to estimate grade effects in mathematics performance ${ }^{1}$, accounting for: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | grade |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status squared |  | school mean of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  | first-generation students |  | percentage of firstgeneration students at the school level |  | student is a female |  | intercept |  |
|  |  | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. | Coeff | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 35 | (2.3) | 20 | (1.4) | 1 | (1.1) | 68 | (7.1) | 6 | (3.9) | 0 | (0.2) | -12 | (2.9) | 481 | (4.1) |
|  | Austria | 36 | (2.7) | 11 | (1.8) | -2 | (1.6) | 62 | (8.2) | -9 | (6.5) | 0 | (0.3) | -28 | (3.3) | 526 | (5.8) |
|  | Belgium | 43 | (2.4) | 4 | (1.4) | 1 | (0.9) | 83 | (14.6) | -3 | (4.7) | 0 | (0.6) | -15 | (2.0) | 528 | (8.0) |
|  | Canada | 44 | (2.5) | 19 | (1.5) | 3 | (1.1) | 29 | (6.8) | 6 | (3.7) | 0 | (0.1) | -13 | (1.9) | 506 | (4.0) |
|  | Chile | 33 | (1.8) | 9 | (1.5) | 1 | (0.7) | 37 | (3.6) | -2 | (10.2) | -1 | (1.1) | -29 | (2.1) | 469 | (4.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 47 | (3.5) | 13 | (2.0) | -3 | (2.0) | 111 | (9.3) | 1 | (9.1) | -2 | (0.9) | -24 | (2.9) | 502 | (4.2) |
|  | Denmark | 34 | (3.9) | 26 | (2.2) | 2 | (1.6) | 44 | (8.0) | -34 | (5.3) | 0 | (0.5) | -18 | (2.2) | 483 | (5.4) |
|  | Estonia | 41 | (2.7) | 16 | (2.0) | 2 | (2.3) | 25 | (6.7) | -20 | (17.0) | -4 | (0.6) | -7 | (2.5) | 530 | (3.3) |
|  | Finland | 52 | (4.4) | 22 | (2.1) | 6 | (1.9) | 38 | (13.2) | -38 | (8.7) | -1 | (0.8) | 1 | (3.1) | 501 | (7.7) |
|  | France | 49 | (4.8) | 16 | (2.3) | 2 | (1.7) | 60 | (9.5) | -6 | (5.8) | 0 | (0.4) | -18 | (2.7) | 509 | (6.3) |
|  | Germany | 41 | (2.1) | 5 | (1.5) | 1 | (1.4) | 108 | (8.3) | -20 | (7.9) | -2 | (0.7) | -28 | (2.6) | 487 | (5.6) |
|  | Greece | 41 | (6.3) | 17 | (1.7) | 1 | (1.2) | 29 | (6.8) | 8 | (6.3) | 0 | (0.2) | -15 | (2.6) | 458 | (4.5) |
|  | Hungary | 32 | (3.0) | 7 | (1.8) | 3 | (1.2) | 64 | (8.6) | 42 | (23.9) | -1 | (0.5) | -27 | (2.5) | 494 | (5.6) |
|  | Iceland | c | c | 19 | (3.2) | 3 | (1.9) | 24 | (9.4) | -31 | (11.0) | -1 | (0.5) | 7 | (3.5) | 454 | (8.4) |
|  | Ireland | 18 | (1.8) | 24 | (1.7) | 1 | (1.8) | 60 | (6.1) | 10 | (4.8) | 0 | (0.3) | -15 | (3.0) | 491 | (4.4) |
|  | Israel | 35 | (4.2) | 21 | (2.6) | 3 | (1.5) | 91 | (14.8) | -12 | (7.7) | 1 | (0.8) | -11 | (4.2) | 446 | (9.7) |
|  | Italy | 35 | (1.9) | 3 | (0.9) | -1 | (0.7) | 54 | (5.5) | -13 | (3.4) | 0 | (0.1) | -23 | (1.7) | 495 | (3.1) |
|  | Japan | c | c | 3 | (2.1) | 1 | (2.2) | 156 | (13.3) | c | c | c | c | -14 | (3.2) | 548 | (5.5) |
|  | Korea | 40 | (14.6) | 25 | (4.7) | 5 | (3.0) | 75 | (20.8) | c | c | c | c | -10 | (5.8) | 555 | (6.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 50 | (2.3) | 12 | (1.8) | 0 | (0.8) | 55 | (5.4) | -7 | (4.3) | 0 | (0.1) | -23 | (2.7) | 481 | (4.7) |
|  | Mexico | 26 | (1.8) | 8 | (1.1) | 2 | (0.4) | 17 | (2.0) | -44 | (6.0) | -1 | (0.5) | -14 | (1.5) | 451 | (3.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 35 | (2.6) | 6 | (1.6) | 0 | (1.1) | 108 | (22.6) | -14 | (9.4) | -1 | (1.1) | -19 | (2.1) | 480 | (8.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 35 | (5.6) | 31 | (2.5) | -1 | (1.8) | 60 | (8.4) | -1 | (4.4) | 0 | (0.4) | -10 | (3.2) | 502 | (9.6) |
|  | Norway | 36 | (17.8) | 24 | (2.5) | -2 | (1.7) | 29 | (29.3) | -21 | (7.8) | -1 | (0.8) | 3 | (4.0) | 474 | (18.0) |
|  | Poland | 80 | (7.0) | 26 | (2.1) | -2 | (1.8) | 37 | (6.9) | c | c | c | c | -5 | (3.7) | 539 | (4.5) |
|  | Portugal | 51 | (2.9) | 17 | (1.5) | 2 | (0.9) | 27 | (4.0) | 10 | (7.1) | 0 | (0.5) | -17 | (2.2) | 540 | (4.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 42 | (3.8) | 21 | (2.2) | -1 | (1.4) | 39 | (7.5) | c | c | c | c | -20 | (3.0) | 530 | (4.4) |
|  | Slovenia | 24 | (6.2) | 1 | (1.7) | 4 | (1.5) | 72 | (12.9) | -34 | (6.7) | 0 | (0.8) | -25 | (2.9) | 484 | (5.2) |
|  | Spain | 64 | (1.5) | 14 | (0.9) | 2 | (0.7) | 21 | (3.0) | -16 | (3.0) | 0 | (0.2) | -24 | (1.5) | 531 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | 67 | (6.7) | 27 | (2.1) | 2 | (1.4) | 29 | (7.8) | -21 | (8.0) | 0 | (0.2) | 3 | (3.0) | 461 | (4.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 52 | (3.0) | 20 | (1.8) | -2 | (1.2) | 20 | (7.9) | -29 | (4.5) | -1 | (0.3) | -20 | (2.4) | 528 | (4.3) |
|  | Turkey | 29 | (2.9) | 1 | (2.4) | -1 | (1.0) | 47 | (9.1) | c | c | c | c | -22 | (2.7) | 553 | (17.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 23 | (5.4) | 20 | (2.3) | 3 | (1.8) | 88 | (8.2) | 4 | (6.2) | 0 | (0.3) | -9 | (3.2) | 465 | (4.9) |
|  | United States | 41 | (3.3) | 21 | (1.8) | 7 | (1.5) | 51 | (9.4) | 9 | (8.0) | 1 | (0.4) | -12 | (3.5) | 457 | (6.5) |
|  | OECD average | 41 | (1.0) | 16 | (0.4) | 1 | (0.3) | 56 | (1.9) | -10 | (1.6) | 0 | (0.1) | -15 | (0.5) | 498 | (1.2) |
|  | Albania | 6 | (3.9) | m | m | m | m | m | m | c | c | c | c | 0 | (4.1) | 395 | (4.0) |
|  | Argentina | 31 | (1.7) | 9 | (1.7) | 2 | (0.9) | 38 | (7.1) | 1 | (12.1) | -2 | (1.0) | -18 | (2.3) | 446 | (5.3) |
|  | Brazil | 31 | (1.2) | 5 | (2.1) | 0 | (0.7) | 26 | (4.3) | -49 | (19.1) | 0 | (1.4) | -25 | (1.8) | 432 | (7.3) |
|  | Bulgaria | 30 | (4.2) | 12 | (1.6) | 1 | (1.1) | 25 | (12.6) | c | c | c | c | -10 | (2.6) | 429 | (8.0) |
|  | Colombia | 25 | (1.3) | 7 | (2.4) | 1 | (0.7) | 26 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | -30 | (2.0) | 444 | (5.7) |
|  | Costa Rica | 26 | (1.3) | 8 | (1.6) | 1 | (0.6) | 25 | (4.2) | -7 | (8.0) | 0 | (0.8) | -29 | (2.3) | 447 | (7.5) |
|  | Croatia | 21 | (2.8) | 9 | (1.9) | -1 | (1.3) | 71 | (13.7) | -10 | (7.6) | -1 | (0.9) | -24 | (2.9) | 504 | (8.1) |
|  | Cyprus* | 39 | (6.0) | 18 | (1.8) | 2 | (1.1) | 61 | (8.7) | -5 | (5.5) | 0 | (0.2) | -14 | (2.4) | 439 | (5.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 36 | (2.2) | 4 | (2.6) | 1 | (1.2) | 48 | (14.5) | 26 | (4.3) | 0 | (1.0) | -22 | (3.3) | 613 | (18.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 17 | (2.7) | 6 | (2.3) | 1 | (0.6) | 27 | (5.6) | c | c | c | c | -6 | (1.9) | 438 | (10.9) |
|  | Jordan | 37 | (5.3) | 12 | (2.1) | 2 | (0.8) | 22 | (14.9) | 6 | (6.6) | 2 | (1.0) | 9 | (11.7) | 393 | (11.4) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 16 | (2.5) | 14 | (2.4) | 0 | (1.5) | 36 | (10.3) | -5 | (5.0) | 0 | (0.3) | -4 | (2.2) | 459 | (5.2) |
|  | Latvia | 53 | (4.0) | 18 | (1.9) | 2 | (1.8) | 25 | (5.9) | c | c | c | c | -7 | (3.0) | 510 | (3.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 40 | (8.9) | 8 | (4.1) | -5 | (2.7) | 107 | (25.4) | -10 | (9.3) | -2 | (1.0) | -27 | (5.2) | 543 | (20.9) |
|  | Lithuania | 32 | (3.4) | 17 | (1.8) | -2 | (1.5) | 47 | (6.9) | c | c | c | c | -7 | (2.6) | 483 | (4.1) |
|  | Macao-China | 50 | (1.7) | 7 | (2.9) | 2 | (1.4) | 8 | (12.2) | 24 | (3.0) | -1 | (0.5) | -26 | (2.3) | 544 | (14.2) |
|  | Malaysia | 79 | (7.0) | 15 | (2.3) | 2 | (0.9) | 53 | (7.2) | c | c | c | c | 2 | (2.1) | 466 | (6.5) |
|  | Montenegro | 9 | (3.1) | 13 | (1.9) | 1 | (1.0) | 76 | (15.6) | 16 | (7.0) | -2 | (1.1) | -11 | (3.2) | 437 | (8.6) |
|  | Peru | 25 | (1.3) | 8 | (2.1) | 1 | (0.6) | 36 | (3.8) | c | c | c | c | -28 | (2.5) | 434 | (6.4) |
|  | Qatar | 28 | (2.2) | 6 | (1.4) | 1 | (0.7) | 26 | (7.9) | 32 | (3.3) | 1 | (0.1) | 2 | (4.1) | 310 | (5.4) |
|  | Romania | -5 | (5.6) | 20 | (2.3) | 5 | (1.0) | 51 | (9.6) | c | c | c | c | -7 | (2.8) | 475 | (7.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 34 | (2.5) | 22 | (2.2) | -1 | (1.5) | 21 | (9.6) | -16 | (6.4) | -1 | (0.5) | -2 | (2.6) | 487 | (4.7) |
|  | Serbia | 33 | (10.4) | 8 | (2.1) | -1 | (1.7) | 81 | (11.8) | -11 | (11.5) | 0 | (0.9) | -26 | (3.9) | 480 | (8.0) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 43 | (5.5) | 6 | (2.4) | -3 | (1.4) | 52 | (6.5) | -27 | (16.1) | -1 | (1.0) | -14 | (2.6) | 674 | (7.6) |
|  | Singapore | 44 | (3.3) | 21 | (2.2) | 0 | (1.2) | 81 | (12.6) | 29 | (4.8) | -1 | (0.3) | -1 | (2.7) | 608 | (9.4) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 47 | (13.2) | 21 | (3.8) | -6 | (2.1) | 114 | (9.6) | c | c | c | c | 3 | (4.1) | 638 | (9.8) |
|  | Thailand | 16 | (3.9) | 13 | (3.0) | 3 | (1.1) | -22 | (10.8) | c | c | c | c | 2 | (3.5) | 418 | (17.5) |
|  | Tunisia | 36 | (1.7) | 7 | (2.0) | 2 | (0.7) | 12 | (7.0) | c | c | c | c | -26 | (1.7) | 429 | (11.5) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 33 | (1.5) | 9 | (1.3) | 3 | (0.8) | 23 | (7.4) | 31 | (2.1) | 1 | (0.1) | -2 | (4.7) | 387 | (4.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 39 | (2.1) | 15 | (2.0) | 3 | (0.9) | 35 | (4.3) | c | c | c | c | -19 | (2.3) | 480 | (4.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | 36 | (4.8) | 12 | (4.1) | 3 | (1.1) | 26 | (15.1) | c | c | c | c | -22 | (4.4) | 550 | (32.4) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on the variables of school policies and practices presented in this table.

See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink 司istu http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932937073

## Learning time

Learning time in test language (LMINS) was computed by multiplying students' responses on the number of minutes on average in the test language class by number of test language class periods per week (ST69 and ST70). Comparable indices were computed for mathematics (MMINS) and science (SMINS).

## Student-level scale indices

## Instrumental motivation to learn mathematics

The index of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics (INSTMOT) was constructed using student responses over the extent they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed to a series of statements in question (ST29) when asked to think about their views on mathematics: Making an effort in mathematics is worth because it will help me in the work that I want to do later on; Learning mathematics is worthwhile for me because it will improve my career <prospects, chances>; Mathematics is an important subject for me because I need it for what I want to study later on; I will learn many things in mathematics that will help me get a job. See Annex A6 for the description of adjusted indices.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Disciplinary climate

The index of disciplinary climate (DISCLIMA) was derived from students' reports on how often the followings happened in their lessons of the language of instruction (ST81): i) students don't listen to what the teacher says; ii) there is noise and disorder; iii) the teacher has to wait a long time for the students to <quieten down>; iv) students cannot work well; and $v$ ) students don't start working for a long time after the lesson begins. In this index higher values indicate a better disciplinary climate.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of disciplinary climate were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of disciplinary climate for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Teacher-student relations

The index of teacher-student relations (STUDREL) was derived from students' level of agreement with the following statements. The question asked (ST86) stated "Thinking about the teachers at your school: to what extent do you agree with the following statements": i) Students get along well with most of my teachers; ii) Most teachers are interested in students' well-being; iii) Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say; iv) if I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers; and v) Most of my teachers treat me fairly. Higher values on this index indicate positive teacher-student relations.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of student-teacher relations were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of student-teacher relations for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Economic, social and cultural status

The PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) was derived from the following three indices: highest occupational status of parents (HISEI), highest educational level of parents in years of education according to ISCED (PARED), and home possessions (HOMEPOS). The index of home possessions (HOMEPOS) comprises all items on the indices of WEALTH, CULTPOSS and HEDRES, as well as books in the home recoded into a four-level categorical variable ( $0-10$ books, 11-25 or 26-100 books, 101-200 or 201-500 books, more than 500 books).

The PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) was derived from a principal component analysis of standardised variables (each variable has an OECD mean of zero and a standard deviation of one), taking the factor scores for the first principal component as measures of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

Principal component analysis was also performed for each participating country or economy to determine to what extent the components of the index operate in similar ways across countries or economy. The analysis revealed that patterns of factor loading were very similar across countries, with all three components contributing to a similar extent to the index (for details on reliability and factor loadings, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

The imputation of components for students with missing data on one component was done on the basis of a regression on the other two variables, with an additional random error component. The final values on the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) for 2012 have an OECD mean of 0 and a standard deviation of one.

ESCS was computed for all students in the five cycles, and ESCS indices for trends analyses were obtained by applying the parameters used to derive standardised values in 2012 to the ESCS components for previous cycles. These values will therefore not be directly comparable to ESCS values in the databases for previous cycles, though the differences are not large for the 2006 and 2009 cycles. ESCS values in earlier cycles were computed using different algorithms, so for 2000 and 2003 the differences are larger.

## Changes to the computation of socio-economic status for PISA 2012

While the computation of socio-economic status followed what had been done in previous cycles, PISA 2012 undertook an important upgrade with respect to the coding of parental occupation. Prior to PISA 2012, the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) was used for the coding of parental occupation. By 2012, however, ISCO-88 was almost 25 years old and it was no longer tenable to maintain its use as an occupational coding scheme. ${ }^{2}$ It was therefore decided to use its replacement, ISCO-08, for occupational coding in PISA 2012.

The change from ISCO-88 to ISCO-08 required an update of the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI) of occupation codes. PISA 2012 therefore used a modified quantification scheme for ISCO-08 (referred to as ISEI-08), as developed by Harry Ganzeboom (2010). ISEI-08 was constructed using a database of 198500 men and women with valid education, occupation and (personal) incomes derived from the combined 2002-07 datasets of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) (Ganzeboom, 2010). The methodology used for this purpose was similar to the one employed in the construction of ISEI for ISCO-68 and ISCO-88 described in different publications (Ganzeboom, de Graff and Treiman, 1992; Ganzeboom and Treiman, 1996; Ganzeboom and Treiman, 2003). ${ }^{3}$

The main differences with regard to the previous ISEI construction are the following:

- A new database was used which is more recent, larger and cross-nationally more diverse than the one used earlier.
- The new ISEI was constructed using data for women and men, while previously only men were used to estimate the scale. The data on income were corrected for hours worked to adjust the different prevalence of part-time work between men and women in many countries.

A range of validation activities accompanied the transition from ISCO-88/ISEI-88 to ISCO-08/ISEI-08, including a comparison of $i$ ) the distributions of ISEI-88 with ISEI-08 in terms of range, mean and standard deviations for both mothers' and fathers' occupations and ii) correlations between the two ISEI indicators and performance, again separately undertaken for mothers' and fathers' occupations.

For this cycle, in order to obtain trends for all cycles from 2000 to 2012, the computation of the indices WEALTH, HEDRES, CULTPOSS and HOMEPOS was based on data from all cycles from 2000 to 2012. HOMEPOS is of particular importance as it is used in the computation of ESCS. These were then standardised on 2012 so that the OECD mean is 0 and the standard deviation is 1 . This means that the indices calculated on the previous cycle will be on the 2012 scale and thus not directly comparable to the indices in the database for the previously released cycles. To estimate item parameters for scaling, a calibration sample from all cycles was used, consisting of 500 students from all countries in the previous cycles, and 750 from 2012, as any particular student questionnaire item only occurs in two-thirds of the questionnaires in 2012.

The items used in the computation of the indices has changed to some extent from cycle to cycle, though cycles they have remained much the same from 2006 to 2012. The earlier cycles were are in general missing a few items that are present in the later cycles, but it was felt leaving out items only present in the later cycles would give too much weight to the earlier cycles. So a superset of all items (except country specific items) in the five cycles was used, and international item parameters were derived from this set.

The second step was to estimate WLEs for the indices, anchoring parameters on the international item set while estimating the country specific item parameters. This is the same procedure used in previous cycles.

## Family wealth

The index of family wealth (WEALTH) is based on students' responses on whether they had the following at home: a room of their own, a link to the Internet, a dishwasher (treated as a country-specific item), a DVD player, and three other country-specific items (some items in ST26); and their responses on the number of cellular phones, televisions, computers, cars and the number of rooms with a bath or shower (ST27).

## Home educational resources

The index of home educational resources (HEDRES) is based on the items measuring the existence of educational resources at home including a desk and a quiet place to study, a computer that students can use for schoolwork, educational software, books to help with students' school work, technical reference books and a dictionary (some items in ST26).

## Cultural possessions

The index of cultural possessions (CULTPOSS) is based on students' responses to whether they had the following at home: classic literature, books of poetry and works of art (some items in ST26).

## The rotated design of the student questionnaire

A major innovation in PISA 2012 is the rotated design of the student questionnaire. One of the main reasons for a rotated design, which had previously been implemented for the cognitive assessment, was to extend the content coverage of the student questionnaire. Table A1.3 provides an overview of the rotation design and content of questionnaire forms for the main survey.

## Table A1.3 Student questionnaire rotation design

| Form A | Common Question Set (all forms) | Question Set 1-Mathematics Attitudes/ <br> Problem Solving | Question Set 3 - Opportunity to Learn/ <br> Learning Strategies |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Form B | Common Question Set (all forms) | Question Set 2 - School Climate/Attitudes <br> towards School/Anxiety | Question Set 1 - Mathematics Attitudes/ <br> Problem Solving |
| Form C | Common Question Set (all forms) | Question Set 3 - Opportunity to Learn/ <br> Learning Strategies | Question Set 2 - School Climate/Attitudes <br> towards School/Anxiety |

Note: For details regarding the questions in each question set, please refer to the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

The PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming) provides all details regarding the rotated design of the student questionnaire in PISA 2012, including its implications in terms of i) proficiency estimates, ii) international reports and trends, iii) further analyses, iv) structure and documentation of the international database, and $v$ ) logistics. The rotated design has negligible implications for proficiency estimates and correlations of proficiency estimates with context constructs. The international database (available at $w w w$. pisa.oecd.org) includes all background variables for each student. The variables based on the questions that students answered reflect their responses; those that are based on questions that were not administered show a distinctive missing code. Rotation allows the estimation of a full co-variance matrix which means that all variables can be correlated with all other variables. It does not affect conclusions in terms of whether or not an effect would be considered significant in multilevel models.

## School-level simple indices

## School and class size

The index of school size (SCHSIZE) was derived by summing up the number of girls and boys at a school (SC07).

## Student-teacher ratio

The student-teacher ratio (STRATIO) was obtained by dividing the school size by the total number of teachers (SC09). The number of part-time teachers was weighted by 0.5 and the number of full-time teachers was weighted by 1.0 in the computation of this index.

The student-mathematics teacher ratio (SMRATIO) was obtained by dividing the school size by the total number of mathematics teachers (SC10Q11 and SC10Q12). The number of part-time mathematics teachers was weighted by 0.5 and the number of full time mathematics teachers was weighted by 1.0 in the computation of this index.

## School type

Schools are classified as either public or private, according to whether a private entity or a public agency has the ultimate power to make decisions concerning its affairs (SC01). This information is combined with SC02 which provides information on the percentage of total funding which comes from government sources to create the index of school type (SCHLTYPE). This index has three categories: (1) government-independent private schools controlled by a non-government organisation or with a governing board not selected by a government agency that receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding from government agencies, (2) government-dependent private schools controlled by a non-government organisation or with a governing board not selected by a government agency that receive more than $50 \%$ of their core funding from government agencies, and (3) public schools controlled and managed by a public education authority or agency.

## Availability of computers

The index of computer availability (RATCMP15) was derived from dividing the number of computers available for educational purposes available to students in the modal grade for 15 -year-olds (SC11Q02) by the number of students in the modal grade for 15 -year-olds (SC11Q01). The wording of the questions asking about computer availability changed between 2006 and 2009. Comparisons involving availability of computers are possible for 2012 data with 2009 data, but not with 2006 or earlier.

The index of computers connected to the Internet (COMPWEB) was derived from dividing the number of computers for educational purposes available to students in the modal grade for 15 -year-olds that are connected to the web (SC11Q03) by the number of computers for educational purposes available to students in the modal grade for 15 -year-olds (SC11Q02).

## Quantity of teaching staff at school

The proportion of fully certified teachers (PROPCERT) was computed by dividing the number of fully certified teachers (SC09Q21 plus $0.5 * S C 09 \mathrm{Q} 22$ ) by the total number of teachers (SC09Q11 plus $0.5 * S C 09 \mathrm{Q} 12$ ). The proportion of teachers who have an ISCED 5A qualification (PROPQUAL) was calculated by dividing the number of these kind of teachers (SC09Q31 plus 0.5*SC09Q32) by the total number of teachers (SC09Q11 plus $0.5 * S C 09 Q 12$ ). The proportion of mathematics teachers (PROPMATH) was computed by dividing the number of mathematics teachers (SC10Q11 plus $0.5 * S C 10 \mathrm{Q} 12$ ) by the total number of teachers (SC09Q11 plus $0.5 * S C 09 \mathrm{Q} 12$ ). The proportion of mathematics teachers who have an ISCED 5A qualification (PROPMA5A) was computed by dividing the number of mathematics teachers who have an ISCED 5A qualification (SC10Q21 plus $0.5 *$ SC10Q22) by the number of mathematics teachers (SC10Q11 plus 0.5*SC10Q12).

Although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 asked school principals about the school's teaching staff, the wording of the questions on the proportion of teachers with an ISCED 5A qualification changed, rendering comparisons impossible.

## Academic selectivity

The index of academic selectivity (SCHSEL) was derived from school principals' responses on how frequently consideration was given to the following two factors when students were admitted to the school, based on a scale with response categories "never", "sometimes" and "always" (SC32Q02 and SC32Q03): students' record of academic performance (including placement tests); and recommendation of feeder schools. This index has the following three categories: (1) schools where these two factors are "never" considered for admission, (2) schools considering at least one of these two factors "sometimes" but neither factor "always", and (3) schools where at least one of these two factors is "always" considered for admission.

Although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 asked school principals about the school's criteria for admitting students, the wording of the questions changed, rendering comparisons impossible.

## Ability grouping

The index of ability grouping in mathematics classes (ABGMATH) was derived from the two items of school principals' reports on whether their school organises mathematics instruction differently for student with different abilities "for all classes", "for some classes", or "not for any classes" (SC15Q01 for mathematics classes study similar content but at different levels and SC15Q02 for different classes study different content or sets of mathematics topics that have different levels of difficulty). This index has the following three categories: (1) no mathematic classes study different levels of difficulty or different content (i.e. "not for any classes" for both SC15Q01 and SC15Q02); (2) some mathematics classes study different levels of difficulty or different content (i.e. "for some classes" for either SC15Q01 or SC15Q02); (3) all mathematics classes study different levels of difficulty or different content (i.e. "for all classes" for either SC15Q01 or SC15Q02).

## Extracurricular activities offered by school

The index of mathematics extracurricular activities at school (MACTIV) was derived from school principals' reports on whether their schools offered the following activities to students in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds in the academic year of the PISA assessment (SC16 and SC21 for the last one): i) mathematics club, ii) mathematics competition, iii) club with a focus on computers/ Information, Communication Technology, and $i v$ ) additional mathematics lessons. This index was developed by summing up the number of activities that a school offers. For "additional mathematics lessons" (SC21), it is counted as one when school principals responded "enrichment mathematics only", "remedial mathematics only" or "without differentiation depending on the prior achievement level of the students"; and it is counted as two when school principals responded "both enrichment and remedial mathematics".

The index of creative extracurricular activities at school (CREACTIV) was derived from school principals' reports on whether their schools offered the following activities to students in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds in the academic year of the PISA assessment (SC16): i) band, orchestra or choir, ii) school play or school musical, and iii) art club or art activities. This index was developed by adding up the number of activities that a school offers.

## Use of assessment

School principals were asked to report whether students' assessments are used for the following purposes (SC18): i) to inform parents about their child's progress; ii) to make decisions about students' retention or promotion; iii) to group students for instructional purposes; iv) to compare the school to district or national performance; v) to monitor the school's progress from year to year; vi) to make judgements about teachers' effectiveness; vii) to identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved; and viii) to compare the school with other schools. The index of use of assessment (ASSESS) was derived from these eight items by adding up the number of "yes" in principals' responses to these questions.

## School responsibility for resource allocation

School principals were asked to report whether "principals", "teachers", "school governing board", "regional or local education authority" or "national education authority" have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks (SC33): i) selecting teachers for hire; ii) firing teachers; iii) establishing teachers' starting salaries; iv) determining teachers' salary increases; v) formulating the school budget; and vi) deciding on budget allocations within the school. The index of school responsibility for resource allocation (RESPRES) was derived from these six items. The ratio of the number of responsibilities that "principals" and/or "teachers" have for these six items to the number of responsibilities that "regional or local education authority" and/or "national education authority" have for these six items was computed. Positive values on this index indicate relatively more responsibility for schools than local, regional or national education authority. This index has an OECD mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 .

Although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 asked school principals about the school's responsibility for resource allocation, the wording of the questions changed, rendering comparisons impossible.

## School responsibility for curriculum and assessment

School principals were asked to report whether "principals", "teachers", "school governing board", "regional or local education authority", or "national education authority" have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks (SC33): i) establishing student assessment policies; ii) choosing which textbooks are used; iii) determining course content; and iv) deciding which courses are offered.

The index of the school responsibility for curriculum and assessment (RESPCUR) was derived from these four items. The ratio of the number of responsibilities that "principals" and/or "teachers" have for these four items to the number of responsibilities that "regional or local education authority" and/or "national education authority" have for these four items was computed. Positive values on this index indicate relatively more responsibility for schools than local, regional or national education authority. This index has an OECD mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 .

Although both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 asked school principals about the school's responsibility for admission and instruction policies, the wording of the questions changed, rendering comparisons impossible.

## School-level scale indices

## School principals' leadership

The index of school management: framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development (LEADCOM) was derived from school principals' responses about the frequency with which they were involved in the following school affairs in the previous school year (SC34): i) use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals; ii) make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school; iii) ensure that teachers work according to the school's educational goals; and $i v$ ) discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings. The index of school management: instructional leadership (LEADINST) was derived from school principals' responses about the frequency with which they were involved in the following school affairs in the previous school year (SC34): i) promote teaching practices based on recent educational research, ii) praise teachers whose students are actively participating in learning, and iii) draw teachers' attention to the importance of pupils' development of critical can social capacities. The index of school management: promoting instructional improvements and professional development (LEADPD) was derived from school principals' responses about the frequency with which they were involved in the following school affairs in the previous school year (SC34): i) take the initiative to discuss matters, when a teacher has problems in his/her classroom; ii) pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms; and iii) solve a problem together with a teacher, when the teacher brings up a classroom problem. The index of school management: teacher participation (LEADTCH) was derived from school principals' responses about the frequency with which they were involved in the following school affairs in the previous school year (SC34): i) provide staff with opportunities to participate in school decision-making; ii) engage teachers to help build a school culture of continuous improvement; and iii) ask teachers to participate in reviewing management practices. Higher values on these indices indicate greater involvement of school principals in school affairs.

## Teacher shortage

The index of teacher shortage (TCSHORT) was derived from four items measuring school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at their school (SC14). These factors are a lack of: i) qualified science teachers; ii) qualified mathematics teachers; iii) qualified <test language> teachers; and iv) qualified teachers of other subjects. Higher values on this index indicate school principals' reports of higher teacher shortage at a school.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of teacher shortage were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of teacher shortage for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Quality of school's educational resources

The index of quality of school educational resources (SCMATEDU) was derived from six items measuring school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at their school (SC14). These factors are: i) shortage or inadequacy of science laboratory equipment; ii) shortage or inadequacy of instructional materials; iii) shortage or inadequacy of computers for instruction; $i v)$ lack or inadequacy of Internet connectivity; v) shortage or inadequacy of computer software for instruction; and vi) shortage or inadequacy of library materials. As all items were inverted for scaling, higher values on this index indicate better quality of educational resources.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of quality of educational resources were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of quality educational resources for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004). One of the questions included to compute the index of quality of educational resources in PISA 2012 ("lack or inadequacy of internet connection") was not included in the PISA 2003 questionnaire. Estimation of the PISA 2003 index treats this question as missing and, under the assumption that the relationship between the items remains unchanged with the inclusion of the new questions, the PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 values on the index of quality of educational resources are comparable after the rescaling.

## Quality of schools' physical infrastructure

The index of quality of physicals' infrastructure (SCMATBUI) was derived from three items measuring school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at their school (SC14). These factors are: i) shortage or inadequacy of school buildings and grounds; ii) shortage or inadequacy of heating/cooling and lighting systems; and iii) shortage or inadequacy of instructional space (e.g. classrooms). As all items were inverted for scaling, higher values on this index indicate better quality of physical infrastructure.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of quality of physical infrastructure were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of quality of physical infrastructure for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Teacher behaviour

The index on teacher-related factors affecting school climate (TEACCLIM) was derived from school principals' reports on the extent to which the learning of students was hindered by the following factors in their schools (SC22): i) students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential; ii) poor student-teacher relations; iii) teachers having to teach students of heterogeneous ability levels within the same class; iv) teachers having to teach students of diverse ethnic backgrounds (i.e. language, culture) within the same class; v) teachers' low expectations of students; vi) teachers not meeting individual students' needs; vii) teacher absenteeism; viii) staff resisting change; ix) teachers being too strict with students; $x$ ) teachers being late for classes; and xi) teachers not being well prepared for classes. As all items were inverted for scaling, higher values on this index indicate a positive teacher behaviour.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004). Four of the questions included to compute the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate in PISA 2012 ("teachers having to teach students of heterogeneous ability levels within the same class," "teachers having to teach students of diverse ethnic backgrounds (i.e. language, culture) within the same class," "teachers being late for classes," and "teachers not being well prepared for classes") were not included in the PISA 2003 questionnaire. Estimation of the PISA 2003 index treats these indices as missing and, under the assumption that the relationship between the items remains unchanged with the inclusion of the new questions, the PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 values on the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate are comparable after the rescaling.

## Student behaviour

The index of student-related factors affecting school climate (STUDCLIM) was derived from school principals' reports on the extent to which the learning of students was hindered by the following factors in their schools (SC22): i) student truancy; ii) students skipping classes; iii) students arriving late for school; iv) students not attending compulsory school events (e.g. sports day) or excursions, v) students lacking respect for teachers; vi) disruption of classes by students; vii) student use of alcohol or illegal drugs; and viii) students intimidating or bullying other students. As all items were inverted for scaling, higher values on this index indicate a positive student behaviour.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of student-related factors affecting school climate were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index of student-related factors affecting school climate for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004). Two of the questions included to compute the index of student-related factors affecting school climate in PISA 2012 ("students arriving late for school," and "students not attending compulsory school events (e.g. sports day) or excursions") were not included in the PISA 2003 questionnaire. Estimation of the PISA 2003 index treats these questions as missing and, under the assumption that the relationship between the items remains unchanged with the inclusion of the new questions, the PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 values on the index of student-related factors affecting school climate are comparable after the rescaling.

## Teacher morale

The index of teacher morale (TCMORALE) was derived from school principals' reports on the extent to which they agree with the following statements considering teachers in their schools (SC26): i) the morale of teachers in this school is high; ii) teachers work with enthusiasm; iii) teachers take pride in this school; and iv) teachers value academic achievement. As all items were inverted for scaling, higher values on this index indicate more positive teacher morale.

For trends analyses, the PISA 2003 values of the index of teacher morale were rescaled to be comparable to those in PISA 2012. As a result, values for the index teacher morale for PISA 2003 reported in this volume may differ from those reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004).

## Notes

1. Note that for ISCO coding 0 "Arm forces", the following recoding was followed: "Officers" were coded as "Managers" (ISCO 1), and "Other armed forces occupations" (drivers, gunners, seaman, generic armed forces) as "Plant and Machine operators" (ISCO 8). In addition, all answers starting with " 97 " (housewives, students, and "vague occupations") were coded into missing.
2. The update from ISCO-88 to ISCO-08 mainly involved i) more adequate categories for IT-related occupations, ii) distinction of military ranks and iii) a revision of the categories classifying different managers
3.Information on ISCO08 and ISEIO8 is included from http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/index.htm and http://home.fsw.vu.nl/hbg.ganzeboom/isco08
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## ANNEX A2

## THE PISA TARGET POPULATION, THE PISA SAMPLES AND THE DEFINITION OF SCHOOLS

## Definition of the PISA target population

PISA 2012 provides an assessment of the cumulative yield of education and learning at a point at which most young adults are still enrolled in initial education.

A major challenge for an international survey is to ensure that international comparability of national target populations is guaranteed in such a venture

Differences between countries in the nature and extent of pre-primary education and care, the age of entry into formal schooling and the institutional structure of education systems do not allow the definition of internationally comparable grade levels of schooling. Consequently, international comparisons of education performance typically define their populations with reference to a target age group. Some previous international assessments have defined their target population on the basis of the grade level that provides maximum coverage of a particular age cohort. A disadvantage of this approach is that slight variations in the age distribution of students across grade levels often lead to the selection of different target grades in different countries, or between education systems within countries, raising serious questions about the comparability of results across, and at times within, countries. In addition, because not all students of the desired age are usually represented in grade-based samples, there may be a more serious potential bias in the results if the unrepresented students are typically enrolled in the next higher grade in some countries and the next lower grade in others. This would exclude students with potentially higher levels of performance in the former countries and students with potentially lower levels of performance in the latter.

In order to address this problem, PISA uses an age-based definition for its target population, i.e. a definition that is not tied to the institutional structures of national education systems. PISA assesses students who were aged between 15 years and 3 (complete) months and 16 years and 2 (complete) months at the beginning of the assessment period, plus or minus a 1 month allowable variation, and who were enrolled in an educational institution with Grade 7 or higher, regardless of the grade levels or type of institution in which they were enrolled, and regardless of whether they were in full-time or part-time education. Educational institutions are generally referred to as schools in this publication, although some educational institutions (in particular, some types of vocational education establishments) may not be termed schools in certain countries. As expected from this definition, the average age of students across OECD countries was 15 years and 9 months. The range in country means was 2 months and 5 days ( 0.18 years), from the minimum country mean of 15 years and 8 months to the maximum country mean of 15 years and 10 months.

Given this definition of population, PISA makes statements about the knowledge and skills of a group of individuals who were born within a comparable reference period, but who may have undergone different educational experiences both in and outside of schools. In PISA, these knowledge and skills are referred to as the yield of education at an age that is common across countries. Depending on countries' policies on school entry, selection and promotion, these students may be distributed over a narrower or a wider range of grades across different education systems, tracks or streams. It is important to consider these differences when comparing PISA results across countries, as observed differences between students at age 15 may no longer appear as students' educational experiences converge later on.

If a country's scale scores in reading, scientific or mathematical literacy are significantly higher than those in another country, it cannot automatically be inferred that the schools or particular parts of the education system in the first country are more effective than those in the second. However, one can legitimately conclude that the cumulative impact of learning experiences in the first country, starting in early childhood and up to the age of 15, and embracing experiences both in school, home and beyond, have resulted in higher outcomes in the literacy domains that PISA measures.

The PISA target population did not include residents attending schools in a foreign country. It does, however, include foreign nationals attending schools in the country of assessment.

To accommodate countries that desired grade-based results for the purpose of national analyses, PISA 2012 provided a sampling option to supplement age-based sampling with grade-based sampling.

## Population coverage

All countries attempted to maximise the coverage of 15 -year-olds enrolled in education in their national samples, including students enrolled in special educational institutions. As a result, PISA 2012 reached standards of population coverage that are unprecedented in international surveys of this kind.

The sampling standards used in PISA permitted countries to exclude up to a total of $5 \%$ of the relevant population either by excluding schools or by excluding students within schools. All but eight countries, Luxembourg (8.34\%), Canada (6.37\%), Denmark (6.10\%), Norway ( $6.09 \%$ ), Estonia ( $5.67 \%$ ), Sweden ( $5.42 \%$ ), the United Kingdom ( $5.36 \%$ ) and the United States ( $5.34 \%$ ), achieved this standard, and in 30 countries and economies, the overall exclusion rate was less than $2 \%$. When language exclusions were accounted for (i.e. removed from the overall exclusion rate), Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States no longer had an exclusion rate greater than $5 \%$. For details, see www.pisa.oecd.org.

Exclusions within the above limits include:

- At the school level: i) schools that were geographically inaccessible or where the administration of the PISA assessment was not considered feasible; and ii) schools that provided teaching only for students in the categories defined under "within-school exclusions", such as schools for the blind. The percentage of 15 -year-olds enrolled in such schools had to be less than $2.5 \%$ of the nationally desired target population [ $0.5 \%$ maximum for $i$ ) and $2 \%$ maximum for $i i)]$. The magnitude, nature and justification of school-level exclusions are documented in the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).
- At the student level: i) students with an intellectual disability; ii) students with a functional disability; iii) students with limited assessment language proficiency; iv) other - a category defined by the national centres and approved by the international centre; and $v$ ) students taught in a language of instruction for the main domain for which no materials were available. Students could not be excluded solely because of low proficiency or common discipline problems. The percentage of 15 -year-olds excluded within schools had to be less than $2.5 \%$ of the nationally desired target population.

Table A2.1 describes the target population of the countries participating in PISA 2012. Further information on the target population and the implementation of PISA sampling standards can be found in the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

- Column 1 shows the total number of 15-year-olds according to the most recent available information, which in most countries meant the year 2011 as the year before the assessment.
- Column 2 shows the number of 15 -year-olds enrolled in schools in Grade 7 or above (as defined above), which is referred to as the eligible population.
- Column 3 shows the national desired target population. Countries were allowed to exclude up to $0.5 \%$ of students a priori from the eligible population, essentially for practical reasons. The following a priori exclusions exceed this limit but were agreed with the PISA Consortium: Belgium excluded $0.23 \%$ of its population for a particular type of student educated while working; Canada excluded $1.14 \%$ of its population from Territories and Aboriginal reserves; Chile excluded $0.04 \%$ of its students who live in Easter Island, Juan Fernandez Archipelago and Antarctica; Indonesia excluded $1.55 \%$ of its students from two provinces because of operational reasons; Ireland excluded $0.05 \%$ of its students in three island schools off the west coast; Latvia excluded $0.08 \%$ of its students in distance learning schools; and Serbia excluded $2.11 \%$ of its students taught in Serbian in Kosovo.
- Column 4 shows the number of students enrolled in schools that were excluded from the national desired target population either from the sampling frame or later in the field during data collection.
- Column 5 shows the size of the national desired target population after subtracting the students enrolled in excluded schools. This is obtained by subtracting Column 4 from Column 3.
- Column 6 shows the percentage of students enrolled in excluded schools. This is obtained by dividing Column 4 by Column 3 and multiplying by 100 .
- Column 7 shows the number of students participating in PISA 2012. Note that in some cases this number does not account for 15-year-olds assessed as part of additional national options.
- Column 8 shows the weighted number of participating students, i.e. the number of students in the nationally defined target population that the PISA sample represents.
- Each country attempted to maximise the coverage of the PISA target population within the sampled schools. In the case of each sampled school, all eligible students, namely those 15 years of age, regardless of grade, were first listed. Sampled students who were to be excluded had still to be included in the sampling documentation, and a list drawn up stating the reason for their exclusion. Column 9 indicates the total number of excluded students, which is further described and classified into specific categories in Table A2.2.
- Column 10 indicates the weighted number of excluded students, i.e. the overall number of students in the nationally defined target population represented by the number of students excluded from the sample, which is also described and classified by exclusion categories in Table A2.2. Excluded students were excluded based on five categories: i) students with an intellectual disability - the student has a mental or emotional disability and is cognitively delayed such that he/she cannot perform in the PISA testing situation; ii) students with a functional disability - the student has a moderate to severe permanent physical disability such that he/she cannot perform in the PISA testing situation; iii) students with a limited assessment language proficiency - the student is unable to read or speak any of the languages of the assessment in the country and would be unable to overcome the language barrier in the testing situation (typically a student who has received less than one year of instruction in the languages of the assessment may be excluded); $i v)$ other - a category defined by the national centres and approved by the international centre; and $v$ ) students taught in a language of instruction for the main domain for which no materials were available.
- Column 11 shows the percentage of students excluded within schools. This is calculated as the weighted number of excluded students (Column 10), divided by the weighted number of excluded and participating students (Column 8 plus Column 10), then multiplied by 100 .
- Column 12 shows the overall exclusion rate, which represents the weighted percentage of the national desired target population excluded from PISA either through school-level exclusions or through the exclusion of students within schools. It is calculated as the school-level exclusion rate (Column 6 divided by 100) plus within-school exclusion rate (Column 11 divided by 100) multiplied by 1 minus the school-level exclusion rate (Column 6 divided by 100). This result is then multiplied by 100 .
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Table A2.1 PISA target populations and samples


Notes: For a full explanation of the details in this table please refer to the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming). The figure for total national population of 15 -year-olds enrolled in Column 2 may occasionally be larger than the total number of 15 -year-olds in Column 1 due to differing data sources.
Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink 泀画 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932937092
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Table A2.1 PISA target populations and samples

|  |  | Population and sample information |  |  |  | Coverage indices |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { excluded students }\end{gathered}$ | Weighted number of excluded students | Within-school exclusion rate (\%) | Overall exclusion rate (\%) | Coverage index 1: Coverage of national desired population | Coverage index 2: Coverage of national enrolled population | Coverage index 3: Coverage of 15-year-old population |
|  |  | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) |
|  | Australia | 505 | 5282 | 2.06 | 3.96 | 0.960 | 0.960 | 0.859 |
| ${ }^{4}$ | Austria | 46 | 1011 | 1.21 | 1.33 | 0.987 | 0.987 | 0.879 |
|  | Belgium | 39 | 367 | 0.31 | 1.39 | 0.986 | 0.984 | 0.955 |
|  | Canada | 1796 | 21013 | 5.69 | 6.37 | 0.936 | 0.926 | 0.833 |
|  | Chile | 18 | 548 | 0.24 | 1.29 | 0.987 | 0.987 | 0.834 |
|  | Czech Republic | 15 | 118 | 0.14 | 1.80 | 0.982 | 0.982 | 0.847 |
|  | Denmark | 368 | 2381 | 3.50 | 6.10 | 0.938 | 0.938 | 0.908 |
|  | Estonia | 143 | 277 | 2.33 | 5.67 | 0.942 | 0.942 | 0.920 |
|  | Finland | 225 | 653 | 1.08 | 1.90 | 0.981 | 0.981 | 0.960 |
|  | France | 52 | 5828 | 0.82 | 4.29 | 0.956 | 0.956 | 0.885 |
|  | Germany | 8 | 1302 | 0.17 | 1.52 | 0.985 | 0.985 | 0.948 |
|  | Greece | 136 | 2304 | 2.33 | 3.58 | 0.964 | 0.964 | 0.874 |
|  | Hungary | 27 | 928 | 1.01 | 2.55 | 0.974 | 0.974 | 0.816 |
|  | Iceland | 155 | 156 | 3.60 | 3.81 | 0.962 | 0.962 | 0.925 |
|  | Ireland | 271 | 2524 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 0.955 | 0.955 | 0.911 |
|  | Israel | 114 | 1884 | 1.72 | 4.07 | 0.959 | 0.959 | 0.906 |
|  | Italy | 741 | 9855 | 1.86 | 3.30 | 0.967 | 0.967 | 0.861 |
|  | Japan | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.10 | 0.979 | 0.979 | 0.909 |
|  | Korea | 17 | 2238 | 0.37 | 0.82 | 0.992 | 0.992 | 0.879 |
|  | Luxembourg | 357 | 357 | 6.07 | 8.34 | 0.872 | 0.916 | 0.893 |
|  | Mexico | 58 | 3247 | 0.24 | 0.74 | 0.993 | 0.993 | 0.627 |
|  | Netherlands | 27 | 1056 | 0.54 | 4.27 | 0.956 | 0.956 | 1.012 |
|  | New Zealand | 255 | 2030 | 3.66 | 4.60 | 0.954 | 0.954 | 0.876 |
|  | Norway | 278 | 3133 | 5.01 | 6.09 | 0.939 | 0.939 | 0.916 |
|  | Poland | 212 | 11566 | 2.96 | 4.56 | 0.954 | 0.954 | 0.891 |
|  | Portugal | 124 | 1560 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 0.984 | 0.984 | 0.883 |
|  | Slovak Republic | 29 | 246 | 0.45 | 2.87 | 0.971 | 0.971 | 0.912 |
|  | Slovenia | 84 | 181 | 0.98 | 1.57 | 0.984 | 0.984 | 0.940 |
|  | Spain | 959 | 14931 | 3.84 | 4.32 | 0.957 | 0.957 | 0.884 |
|  | Sweden | 201 | 3789 | 3.84 | 5.42 | 0.946 | 0.946 | 0.930 |
|  | Switzerland | 256 | 1093 | 1.35 | 4.14 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.914 |
|  | Turkey | 21 | 3684 | 0.42 | 1.48 | 0.985 | 0.985 | 0.684 |
|  | United Kingdom | 486 | 20173 | 2.85 | 5.36 | 0.946 | 0.946 | 0.932 |
|  | United States | 319 | 162194 | 4.39 | 5.34 | 0.946 | 0.946 | 0.887 |
|  | Albania | 1 | 10 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.552 |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | Argentina | 12 | 641 | 0.12 | 0.74 | 0.993 | 0.993 | 0.797 |
| ๕ | Brazil | 44 | 4900 | 0.20 | 1.43 | 0.986 | 0.986 | 0.691 |
|  | Bulgaria | 6 | 80 | 0.15 | 2.49 | 0.974 | 0.974 | 0.773 |
|  | Colombia | 23 | 789 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.630 |
|  | Costa Rica | 2 | 12 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.496 |
|  | Croatia | 91 | 627 | 1.36 | 2.23 | 0.978 | 0.978 | 0.945 |
|  | Cyprus* | 157 | 200 | 2.03 | 3.27 | 0.967 | 0.967 | 0.969 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 38 | 518 | 0.73 | 1.75 | 0.982 | 0.982 | 0.839 |
|  | Indonesia | 2 | 860 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.997 | 0.982 | 0.634 |
|  | Jordan | 19 | 304 | 0.27 | 0.38 | 0.996 | 0.996 | 0.858 |
|  | Kazakhstan | 25 | 951 | 0.45 | 3.34 | 0.966 | 0.966 | 0.806 |
|  | Latvia | 14 | 76 | 0.47 | 3.89 | 0.960 | 0.959 | 0.854 |
|  | Liechtenstein | 13 | 13 | 3.97 | 4.22 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.753 |
|  | Lithuania | 130 | 867 | 2.56 | 3.98 | 0.960 | 0.960 | 0.858 |
|  | Macao-China | 3 | 3 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.813 |
|  | Malaysia | 7 | 554 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.794 |
|  | Montenegro | 4 | 8 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.997 | 0.997 | 0.897 |
|  | Peru | 8 | 549 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.719 |
|  | Qatar | 85 | 85 | 0.77 | 2.47 | 0.975 | 0.975 | 0.943 |
|  | Romania | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.36 | 0.965 | 0.965 | 0.964 |
|  | Russian Federation | 69 | 11940 | 1.01 | 2.38 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.921 |
|  | Serbia | 10 | 136 | 0.20 | 2.80 | 0.971 | 0.951 | 0.848 |
|  | Shanghai-China | 8 | 107 | 0.13 | 1.48 | 0.985 | 0.985 | 0.788 |
|  | Singapore | 33 | 315 | 0.61 | 1.17 | 0.988 | 0.988 | 0.952 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 44 | 2029 | 0.69 | 1.21 | 0.988 | 0.988 | 0.891 |
|  | Thailand | 12 | 1144 | 0.16 | 1.31 | 0.987 | 0.987 | 0.716 |
|  | Tunisia | 5 | 130 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.913 |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 11 | 37 | 0.09 | 2.05 | 0.979 | 0.979 | 0.832 |
|  | Uruguay | 15 | 99 | 0.25 | 0.28 | 0.997 | 0.997 | 0.728 |
|  | Viet Nam | 1 | 198 | 0.02 | 0.72 | 0.993 | 0.993 | 0.557 |

Notes: For a full explanation of the details in this table please refer to the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming). The figure for total national population of 15 -year-olds enrolled in Column 2 may occasionally be larger than the total number of 15 -year-olds in Column 1 due to differing data sources.
Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table A2.2 Exclusions

|  |  | Student exclusions (unweighted) |  |  |  |  |  | Student exclusions (weighted) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of excluded students with functional disability (Code 1) | Number of excluded students with intellectual disability (Code 2) | Number of excluded students because of language (Code 3) | Number of excluded students for other reasons (Code 4) | Number of excluded students because of no materials available in the language of instruction (Code 5) | Total number of excluded students | Weighted number of excluded students with functional disability (Code 1) | Weighted number of excluded students with intellectual disability (Code 2) | Weighted number of excluded students because of language (Code 3) | Weighted number of excluded students for other reasons (Code 4) | Number of excluded students because of no materials available in the language of instruction (Code 5) | Total weighted number of excluded students |
|  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 39 | 395 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 505 | 471 | 3925 | 886 | 0 | 0 | 5282 |
| U | Austria | 11 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 332 | 438 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 1011 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 5 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 24 | 154 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 367 |
|  | Canada | 82 | 1593 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 1796 | 981 | 18682 | 1350 | 0 | 0 | 21013 |
|  | Chile | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 74 | 474 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548 |
|  | Czech Republic | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 84 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
|  | Denmark | 10 | 204 | 112 | 42 | 0 | 368 | 44 | 1469 | 559 | 310 | 0 | 2381 |
|  | Estonia | 7 | 134 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 14 | 260 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 277 |
|  | Finland | 5 | 80 | 101 | 15 | 24 | 225 | 43 | 363 | 166 | 47 | 35 | 653 |
|  | France | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 5828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5828 |
|  | Germany | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 705 | 597 | 0 | 0 | 1302 |
|  | Greece | 3 | 18 | 4 | 111 | 0 | 136 | 49 | 348 | 91 | 1816 | 0 | 2304 |
|  | Hungary | 1 | 15 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 27 | 36 | 568 | 27 | 296 | 0 | 928 |
|  | Iceland | 5 | 105 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 155 | 5 | 105 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 156 |
|  | Ireland | 13 | 159 | 33 | 66 | 0 | 271 | 121 | 1521 | 283 | 599 | 0 | 2524 |
|  | Israel | 9 | 91 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 133 | 1492 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 1884 |
|  | Italy | 64 | 566 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 741 | 596 | 7899 | 1361 | 0 | 0 | 9855 |
|  | Japan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Luxembourg | 6 | 261 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 357 | 6 | 261 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 357 |
|  | Mexico | 21 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 812 | 2390 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 3247 |
|  | Netherlands | 5 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 188 | 819 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1056 |
|  | New Zealand | 27 | 118 | 99 | 0 | 11 | 255 | 235 | 926 | 813 | 0 | 57 | 2030 |
|  | Norway | 11 | 192 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 120 | 2180 | 832 | 0 | 0 | 3133 |
|  | Poland | 23 | 89 | 6 | 88 | 6 | 212 | 1470 | 5187 | 177 | 4644 | 89 | 11566 |
|  | Portugal | 69 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 860 | 605 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 1560 |
|  | Korea | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 223 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2238 |
|  | Slovak Republic | 2 | 14 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 29 | 22 | 135 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 246 |
|  | Slovenia | 13 | 27 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 23 | 76 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 181 |
|  | Spain | 56 | 679 | 224 | 0 | 0 | 959 | 618 | 11330 | 2984 | 0 | 0 | 14931 |
|  | Sweden | 120 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 2218 | 0 | 1571 | 0 | 0 | 3789 |
|  | Switzerland | 7 | 99 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 41 | 346 | 706 | 0 | 0 | 1093 |
|  | Turkey | 5 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 757 | 2556 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 3684 |
|  | United Kingdom | 40 | 405 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 486 | 1468 | 15514 | 3191 | 0 | 0 | 20173 |
|  | United States | 37 | 219 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 319 | 18399 | 113965 | 29830 | 0 | 0 | 162194 |
|  | Albania | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 84 | 557 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 641 |
| ส | Brazil | 17 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 1792 | 3108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4900 |
| - | Bulgaria | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
|  | Colombia | 12 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 397 | 378 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 789 |
|  | Costa Rica | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
|  | Croatia | 10 | 78 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 69 | 539 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 627 |
|  | Cyprus* | 8 | 54 | 60 | 35 | 0 | 157 | 9 | 64 | 72 | 55 | 0 | 200 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 4 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 57 | 446 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 518 |
|  | Indonesia | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 426 | 0 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 860 |
|  | Jordan | 8 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 109 | 72 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 304 |
|  | Kazakhstan | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 317 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 951 |
|  | Latvia | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 45 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
|  | Liechtenstein | 1 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
|  | Lithuania | 10 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 66 | 801 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 867 |
|  | Macao-China | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | Malaysia | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 274 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 554 |
|  | Montenegro | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | Peru | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 269 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 549 |
|  | Qatar | 23 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 23 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
|  | Romania | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Russian Federation | 25 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 4345 | 6934 | 660 | 0 | 0 | 11940 |
|  | Serbia | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 53 | 55 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
|  | Shanghai-China | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 80 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
|  | Singapore | 5 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 157 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 315 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 6 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 296 | 1664 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 2029 |
|  | Thailand | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 1131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1144 |
|  | Tunisia | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 104 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 26 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
|  | Uruguay | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 66 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
|  | Viet Nam | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |

Exclusion codes:
Code 1 Functional disability - student has a moderate to severe permanent physical disability.
Code 2 Intellectual disability - student has a mental or emotional disability and has either been tested as cognitively delayed or is considered in the professional opinion of qualified staff to be cognitively delayed.
Code 3 Limited assessment language proficiency - student is not a native speaker of any of the languages of the assessment in the country and has been resident in the country for less than one year.
Code 4 Other reasons defined by the national centres and approved by the international centre
Code 5 No materials available in the language of instruction.
Note: For a full explanation of the details in this table please refer to the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).
Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

- Column 13 presents an index of the extent to which the national desired target population is covered by the PISA sample. Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States were the only countries where the coverage is below $95 \%$.
- Column 14 presents an index of the extent to which 15-year-olds enrolled in schools are covered by the PISA sample. The index measures the overall proportion of the national enrolled population that is covered by the non-excluded portion of the student sample. The index takes into account both school-level and student-level exclusions. Values close to 100 indicate that the PISA sample represents the entire education system as defined for PISA 2012. The index is the weighted number of participating students (Column 8) divided by the weighted number of participating and excluded students (Column 8 plus Column 10), times the nationally defined target population (Column 5) divided by the eligible population (Column 2).
- Column 15 presents an index of the coverage of the 15-year-old population. This index is the weighted number of participating students (Column 8) divided by the total population of 15 -year-old students (Column 1 ).

This high level of coverage contributes to the comparability of the assessment results. For example, even assuming that the excluded students would have systematically scored worse than those who participated, and that this relationship is moderately strong, an exclusion rate in the order of $5 \%$ would likely lead to an overestimation of national mean scores of less than 5 score points (on a scale with an international mean of 500 score points and a standard deviation of 100 score points). This assessment is based on the following calculations: if the correlation between the propensity of exclusions and student performance is 0.3 , resulting mean scores would likely be overestimated by 1 score point if the exclusion rate is $1 \%$, by 3 score points if the exclusion rate is $5 \%$, and by 6 score points if the exclusion rate is $10 \%$. If the correlation between the propensity of exclusions and student performance is 0.5 , resulting mean scores would be overestimated by 1 score point if the exclusion rate is $1 \%$, by 5 score points if the exclusion rate is $5 \%$, and by 10 score points if the exclusion rate is $10 \%$. For this calculation, a model was employed that assumes a bivariate normal distribution for performance and the propensity to participate. For details, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

## Sampling procedures and response rates

The accuracy of any survey results depends on the quality of the information on which national samples are based as well as on the sampling procedures. Quality standards, procedures, instruments and verification mechanisms were developed for PISA that ensured that national samples yielded comparable data and that the results could be compared with confidence.

Most PISA samples were designed as two-stage stratified samples (where countries applied different sampling designs, these are documented in the PISA 2012 Technical Report [OECD, forthcoming]). The first stage consisted of sampling individual schools in which 15-year-old students could be enrolled. Schools were sampled systematically with probabilities proportional to size, the measure of size being a function of the estimated number of eligible (15-year-old) students enrolled. A minimum of 150 schools were selected in each country (where this number existed), although the requirements for national analyses often required a somewhat larger sample. As the schools were sampled, replacement schools were simultaneously identified, in case a sampled school chose not to participate in PISA 2012.

In the case of Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Macao-China and Qatar, all schools and all eligible students within schools were included in the sample.

Experts from the PISA Consortium performed the sample selection process for most participating countries and monitored it closely in those countries that selected their own samples. The second stage of the selection process sampled students within sampled schools. Once schools were selected, a list of each sampled school's 15 -year-old students was prepared. From this list, 35 students were then selected with equal probability (all 15-year-old students were selected if fewer than 35 were enrolled). The number of students to be sampled per school could deviate from 35, but could not be less than 20.

Data-quality standards in PISA required minimum participation rates for schools as well as for students. These standards were established to minimise the potential for response biases. In the case of countries meeting these standards, it was likely that any bias resulting from non-response would be negligible, i.e. typically smaller than the sampling error.

A minimum response rate of $85 \%$ was required for the schools initially selected. Where the initial response rate of schools was between $65 \%$ and $85 \%$, however, an acceptable school response rate could still be achieved through the use of replacement schools. This procedure brought with it a risk of increased response bias. Participating countries were, therefore, encouraged to persuade as many of the schools in the original sample as possible to participate. Schools with a student participation rate between $25 \%$ and $50 \%$ were not regarded as participating schools, but data from these schools were included in the database and contributed to the various estimations. Data from schools with a student participation rate of less than $25 \%$ were excluded from the database.

PISA 2012 also required a minimum participation rate of $80 \%$ of students within participating schools. This minimum participation rate had to be met at the national level, not necessarily by each participating school. Follow-up sessions were required in schools in which too few students had participated in the original assessment sessions. Student participation rates were calculated over all original schools, and also over all schools, whether original sample or replacement schools, and from the participation of students in both the original assessment and any follow-up sessions. A student who participated in the original or follow-up cognitive sessions was regarded as a participant. Those who attended only the questionnaire session were included in the international database and contributed to the statistics presented in this publication if they provided at least a description of their father's or mother's occupation.
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Table A2.3 Response rates


Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table A2.3 Response rates

|  |  | Final sample - after school replacement |  | Final sample - students within schools after school replacement |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of responding schools (unweighted) | Number of responding and non-responding schools (unweighted) | Weighted student participation rate after replacement (\%) | Number of students assessed (weighted) | Number of students sampled (assessed and absent) (weighted) | Number of students assessed (unweighted) | Number of students sampled (assessed and absent) (unweighted) |
|  |  | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) |
|  | Australia | 757 | 790 | 87 | 213495 | 246012 | 17491 | 20799 |
| U | Austria | 191 | 191 | 92 | 75393 | 82242 | 4756 | 5318 |
|  | Belgium | 282 | 294 | 91 | 103914 | 114360 | 9649 | 10595 |
|  | Canada | 840 | 907 | 81 | 261928 | 324328 | 20994 | 25835 |
|  | Chile | 221 | 224 | 95 | 214558 | 226689 | 6857 | 7246 |
|  | Czech Republic | 295 | 297 | 90 | 73536 | 81642 | 6528 | 7222 |
|  | Denmark | 339 | 366 | 89 | 56096 | 62988 | 7463 | 8496 |
|  | Estonia | 206 | 206 | 93 | 10807 | 11634 | 5867 | 6316 |
|  | Finland | 311 | 313 | 91 | 54126 | 59653 | 8829 | 9789 |
|  | France | 223 | 231 | 89 | 605371 | 676730 | 5641 | 6308 |
|  | Germany | 228 | 233 | 93 | 692226 | 742416 | 4990 | 5355 |
|  | Greece | 188 | 192 | 97 | 92444 | 95580 | 5125 | 5301 |
|  | Hungary | 204 | 208 | 93 | 84032 | 90652 | 4810 | 5184 |
|  | Iceland | 133 | 140 | 85 | 3503 | 4135 | 3503 | 4135 |
|  | Ireland | 183 | 185 | 84 | 45115 | 53644 | 5016 | 5977 |
|  | Israel | 172 | 186 | 90 | 91181 | 101288 | 6061 | 6727 |
|  | Italy | 1186 | 1232 | 93 | 473104 | 510005 | 38084 | 41003 |
|  | Japan | 191 | 200 | 96 | 1034803 | 1076786 | 6351 | 6609 |
|  | Korea | 156 | 157 | 99 | 595461 | 603004 | 5033 | 5101 |
|  | Luxembourg | 42 | 42 | 95 | 5260 | 5523 | 5260 | 5523 |
|  | Mexico | 1468 | 1562 | 94 | 1193866 | 1271639 | 33786 | 35972 |
|  | Netherlands | 177 | 199 | 85 | 148432 | 174697 | 4434 | 5215 |
|  | New Zealand | 177 | 197 | 85 | 40397 | 47703 | 5248 | 6206 |
|  | Norway | 197 | 208 | 91 | 51155 | 56286 | 4686 | 5156 |
|  | Poland | 182 | 188 | 88 | 325389 | 371434 | 5629 | 6452 |
|  | Portugal | 187 | 195 | 87 | 80719 | 92395 | 5608 | 6426 |
|  | Slovak Republic | 231 | 236 | 94 | 50544 | 53912 | 5737 | 6106 |
|  | Slovenia | 335 | 353 | 90 | 16146 | 17849 | 7211 | 7921 |
|  | Spain | 902 | 904 | 90 | 334382 | 372042 | 26443 | 29027 |
|  | Sweden | 209 | 211 | 92 | 87359 | 94784 | 4739 | 5141 |
|  | Switzerland | 410 | 422 | 92 | 72116 | 78424 | 11218 | 12138 |
|  | Turkey | 169 | 170 | 98 | 850830 | 866269 | 4847 | 4939 |
|  | United Kingdom | 505 | 550 | 86 | 528231 | 613736 | 12638 | 14649 |
|  | United States | 161 | 207 | 89 | 2429718 | 2734268 | 6094 | 6848 |
|  | Albania | 204 | 204 | 92 | 39275 | 42466 | 4743 | 5102 |
| F | Argentina | 219 | 229 | 88 | 457294 | 519733 | 5804 | 6680 |
| こ | Brazil | 837 | 886 | 90 | 2133035 | 2368438 | 19877 | 22326 |
|  | Bulgaria | 187 | 188 | 96 | 51819 | 54145 | 5280 | 5508 |
|  | Colombia | 352 | 363 | 93 | 507178 | 544862 | 11164 | 12045 |
|  | Costa Rica | 191 | 193 | 89 | 35525 | 39930 | 4582 | 5187 |
|  | Croatia | 163 | 164 | 92 | 41912 | 45473 | 6153 | 6675 |
|  | Cyprus* | 117 | 131 | 93 | 8719 | 9344 | 5078 | 5458 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 147 | 156 | 93 | 62059 | 66665 | 4659 | 5004 |
|  | Indonesia | 206 | 210 | 95 | 2478961 | 2605254 | 5579 | 5885 |
|  | Jordan | 233 | 233 | 95 | 105493 | 111098 | 7038 | 7402 |
|  | Kazakhstan | 218 | 218 | 99 | 206053 | 208411 | 5808 | 5874 |
|  | Latvia | 211 | 213 | 91 | 14579 | 16039 | 5276 | 5785 |
|  | Liechtenstein | 12 | 12 | 93 | 293 | 314 | 293 | 314 |
|  | Lithuania | 216 | 216 | 92 | 30429 | 33042 | 4618 | 5018 |
|  | Macao-China | 45 | 45 | 99 | 5335 | 5366 | 5335 | 5366 |
|  | Malaysia | 164 | 164 | 94 | 405983 | 432080 | 5197 | 5529 |
|  | Montenegro | 51 | 51 | 94 | 7233 | 7714 | 4799 | 5117 |
|  | Peru | 240 | 243 | 96 | 398193 | 414728 | 6035 | 6291 |
|  | Qatar | 157 | 164 | 100 | 10966 | 10996 | 10966 | 10996 |
|  | Romania | 178 | 178 | 98 | 137860 | 140915 | 5074 | 5188 |
|  | Russian Federation | 227 | 227 | 97 | 1141317 | 1172539 | 6418 | 6602 |
|  | Serbia | 152 | 160 | 93 | 60366 | 64658 | 4681 | 5017 |
|  | Shanghai-China | 155 | 155 | 98 | 83821 | 85127 | 6374 | 6467 |
|  | Singapore | 172 | 176 | 94 | 47465 | 50330 | 5546 | 5887 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 163 | 163 | 96 | 281799 | 292542 | 6046 | 6279 |
|  | Thailand | 239 | 240 | 99 | 695088 | 702818 | 6606 | 6681 |
|  | Tunisia | 152 | 153 | 90 | 108342 | 119917 | 4391 | 4857 |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 453 | 460 | 95 | 38228 | 40384 | 11460 | 12148 |
|  | Uruguay | 180 | 180 | 90 | 35800 | 39771 | 5315 | 5904 |
|  | Viet Nam | 162 | 162 | 100 | 955222 | 956517 | 4959 | 4966 |

Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table A2.3 shows the response rates for students and schools, before and after replacement.

- Column 1 shows the weighted participation rate of schools before replacement. This is obtained by dividing Column 2 by Column 3, multiply by 100 .
- Column 2 shows the weighted number of responding schools before school replacement (weighted by student enrolment).
- Column 3 shows the weighted number of sampled schools before school replacement (including both responding and nonresponding schools, weighted by student enrolment).
- Column 4 shows the unweighted number of responding schools before school replacement.
- Column 5 shows the unweighted number of responding and non-responding schools before school replacement.
- Column 6 shows the weighted participation rate of schools after replacement. This is obtained by dividing Column 7 by Column 8, multiply by 100 .
- Column 7 shows the weighted number of responding schools after school replacement (weighted by student enrolment).
- Column 8 shows the weighted number of schools sampled after school replacement (including both responding and non-responding schools, weighted by student enrolment).
- Column 9 shows the unweighted number of responding schools after school replacement.
- Column 10 shows the unweighted number of responding and non-responding schools after school replacement.
- Column 11 shows the weighted student participation rate after replacement. This is obtained by dividing Column 12 by Column 13, multiply by 100 .
- Column 12 shows the weighted number of students assessed.
- Column 13 shows the weighted number of students sampled (including both students who were assessed and students who were absent on the day of the assessment).
- Column 14 shows the unweighted number of students assessed. Note that any students in schools with student-response rates less than $50 \%$ were not included in these rates (both weighted and unweighted).
- Column 15 shows the unweighted number of students sampled (including both students that were assessed and students who were absent on the day of the assessment). Note that any students in schools where fewer than half of the eligible students were assessed were not included in these rates (neither weighted nor unweighted).


## Definition of schools

In some countries, sub-units within schools were sampled instead of schools and this may affect the estimation of the between-school variance components. In Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Romania and Slovenia, schools with more than one study programme were split into the units delivering these programmes. In the Netherlands, for schools with both lower and upper secondary programmes, schools were split into units delivering each programme level. In the Flemish community of Belgium, in the case of multi-campus schools, implantations (campuses) were sampled, whereas in the French Community, in the case of multi-campus schools, the larger administrative units were sampled. In Australia, for schools with more than one campus, the individual campuses were listed for sampling. In Argentina, Croatia and Dubai (United Arab Emirates), schools that had more than one campus had the locations listed for sampling. In Spain, the schools in the Basque region with multi-linguistic models were split into linguistic models for sampling.

## Grade levels

Students assessed in PISA 2012 are at various grade levels. The percentage of students at each grade level is presented by country and economy in Table A2.4a and by gender within each country and economy in Table A2.4b.
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Table A2.4a Percentage of students at each grade level
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Table A2.4b Percentage of students at each grade level, by gender
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Table A2.4b Percentage of students at each grade level, by gender


Information for the adjudicated regions is available on line

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (त्iाist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932937092

## ANNEX A3

## TECHNICAL NOTES ON ANALYSES IN THIS VOLUME

## Methods and definitions

## Relative risk or increased likelihood

The relative risk is a measure of the association between an antecedent factor and an outcome factor. The relative risk is simply the ratio of two risks, i.e. the risk of observing the outcome when the antecedent is present and the risk of observing the outcome when the antecedent is not present. Figure A3.1 presents the notation that is used in the following.

- Figure A3.1

Labels used in a two-way table

| $p_{11}$ | $p_{12}$ | $p_{1 .}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{21}$ | $p_{22}$ | $p_{2 .}$ |
| $p_{.1}$ | $p_{.2}$ | $p_{. .}$ |

$p_{\text {.. }}$ is equal to $\frac{n_{. .}}{n_{. .}}$, with $n_{. .}$the total number of students and $p_{. .}$is therefore equal to $1, p_{i .}, p_{. j}$ respectively represent the marginal probabilities for each row and for each column. The marginal probabilities are equal to the marginal frequencies divided by the total number of students. Finally, the $p_{i j}$ represents the probabilities for each cell and are equal to the number of observations in a particular cell divided by the total number of observations.

In PISA, the rows represent the antecedent factor, with the first row for "having the antecedent" and the second row for "not having the antecedent". The columns represent the outcome: the first column for "having the outcome" and the second column for "not having the outcome". The relative risk is then equal to:
$R R=\frac{\left(p_{11} / p_{1 .}\right)}{\left(p_{21} / p_{2 .}\right)}$

## Attributable risk or population relevance

The attributable risk, also referred to as population relevance in the text and tables of this volume, is interpreted as follows: if the risk factor could be eliminated, then the rate of occurrence of the outcome characteristic in the population would be reduced by this coefficient. The attributable risk is equal to (see Figure A3.1 for the notation that is used in the following formula):
$A R=\frac{\left(p_{11} p_{22}\right)-\left(p_{12} p_{21}\right)}{\left(p_{.1} p_{2 .}\right)}$
The coefficients are multiplied by 100 to express the result as a percentage.

## Statistics based on multilevel models

Statistics based on multi level models include variance components (between- and within-school variance), the index of inclusion derived from these components, and regression coefficients where this has been indicated. Multilevel models are generally specified as two-level regression models (the student and school levels), with normally distributed residuals, and estimated with maximum likelihood estimation. Where the dependent variable is mathematics performance, the estimation uses five plausible values for each student's performance on the mathematics scale. Models were estimated using Mplus® software

In multilevel models, weights are used at both the student and school levels. The purpose of these weights is to account for differences in the probabilities of students being selected in the sample. Since PISA applies a two-stage sampling procedure, these differences are due to factors at both the school and the student levels. For the multilevel models, student final weights (W_FSTUWT) were used. Within-school-weights correspond to student final weights, rescaled to sum up within each school to the school sample size. Betweenschool weights correspond to the sum of student final weights (W_FSTUWT) within each school. The definition of between-school weights has changed with respect to PISA 2009.

The index of inclusion is defined and estimated as:

$$
100 * \frac{\sigma_{w}^{2}}{\sigma_{w}^{2}+\sigma_{b}^{2}}
$$

where $\sigma_{w}^{2}$ and $\sigma_{b}^{2}$, respectively, represent the within- and between-variance estimates.

The results in multilevel models, and the between-school variance estimate in particular, depend on how schools are defined and organised within countries and by the units that were chosen for sampling purposes. For example, in some countries, some of the schools in the PISA sample were defined as administrative units (even if they spanned several geographically separate institutions, as in Italy); in others they were defined as those parts of larger educational institutions that serve 15-year-olds; in still others they were defined as physical school buildings; and in others they were defined from a management perspective (e.g. entities having a principal). The PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming) and Annex A2 provide an overview of how schools were defined. In Slovenia, the primary sampling unit is defined as a group of students who follow the same study programme within a school (an educational track within a school). So in this particular case the between-school variance is actually the within-school, between-track variation. The use of stratification variables in the selection of schools may also affect the estimate of the between-school variance, particularly if stratification variables are associated with between-school differences.

Because of the manner in which students were sampled, the within-school variation includes variation between classes as well as between students.

Multiple imputation replaces each missing value with a set of plausible values that represent the uncertainty about the right value to impute. The multiple imputed data sets are then analysed by using standard procedures for complete data and by combining results from these analyses. Five imputed values are computed for each missing value. Different methods can be used according to the pattern of missing values. For arbitrary missing data patterns, the MCMC (Monte Carlo Markov Chain) approach can be used.

This approach is used with the SAS procedure MI for the multilevel analyses in this volume. Multiple imputation is conducted separately for each model and each country, except for the model with all variables (Tables IV.1.12a, IV.1.12b and IV.1.12c) in which the data were constructed from imputed data for the individual models, such as the model for learning environment, model for selecting and grouping students, etc. Where continuous values are generated for missing discrete variables, these are rounded to the nearest discrete value of the variable. Each of the five plausible value of mathematics performance is analysed by Mplus ${ }^{\circledR}$ software using one of the five imputed data sets, which were combined taking account of the between imputation variance.

## Standard errors and significance tests

The statistics in this report represent estimates of national performance based on samples of students, rather than values that could be calculated if every student in every country had answered every question. Consequently, it is important to measure the degree of uncertainty of the estimates. In PISA, each estimate has an associated degree of uncertainty, which is expressed through a standard error. The use of confidence intervals provides a way to make inferences about the population means and proportions in a manner that reflects the uncertainty associated with the sample estimates. From an observed sample statistic and assuming a normal distribution, it can be inferred that the corresponding population result would lie within the confidence interval in 95 out of 100 replications of the measurement on different samples drawn from the same population.

In many cases, readers are primarily interested in whether a given value in a particular country is different from a second value in the same or another country, e.g. whether girls in a country perform better than boys in the same country. In the tables and charts used in this report, differences are labelled as statistically significant when a difference of that size, smaller or larger, would be observed less than $5 \%$ of the time, if there were actually no difference in corresponding population values. Similarly, the risk of reporting a correlation as significant if there is, in fact, no correlation between two measures, is contained at $5 \%$.

Throughout the report, significance tests were undertaken to assess the statistical significance of the comparisons made.

## Gender differences and differences between subgroup means

Gender differences in student performance or other indices were tested for statistical significance. Positive differences indicate higher scores for boys while negative differences indicate higher scores for girls. Generally, differences marked in bold in the tables in this volume are statistically significant at the $95 \%$ confidence level.

Similarly, differences between other groups of students (e.g. native students and students with an immigrant background) were tested for statistical significance. The definitions of the subgroups can in general be found in the tables and the text accompanying the analysis. All differences marked in bold in the tables presented in Annex B of this report are statistically significant at the $95 \%$ level.

## Differences between subgroup means, after accounting for other variables

For many tables, subgroup comparisons were performed both on the observed difference ("before accounting for other variables") and after accounting for other variables, such as the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students (ESCS). The adjusted differences were estimated using linear regression and tested for significance at the $95 \%$ confidence level. Significant differences are marked in bold.

## Performance differences between the top and bottom quartiles of PISA indices and scales

Differences in average performance between the top and bottom quarters of the PISA indices and scales were tested for statistical significance. Figures marked in bold indicate that performance between the top and bottom quarters of students on the respective index is statistically significantly different at the $95 \%$ confidence level.

## Differences between subgroups of schools

In this Volume, schools are compared across several aspects, such as resource allocation or performance. For this purpose, schools are grouped in categories by socio-economic status of students and schools, public-private status, lower and upper secondary education and school location. The differences between subgroups of schools are tested for statistical significance in the following way:

- Socio-economic status of students: Students in the top quarter of ESCS are compared to students in the bottom quarter of ESCS. If the difference is statistically significant at the $95 \%$ confidence levels, both figures are marked in bold. The second and third quarters do not enter the comparison
- Socio-economic status of schools: advantaged schools are compared to disadvantaged schools. If the difference is statistically significant at the $95 \%$ confidence levels, both figures are marked in bold. Average schools do not enter the comparison.
- Public and private schools: Government-dependent and government-independent private schools are jointly considered as private schools. Figures in bold in data tables presented in Annex B of this report indicate statistically significant differences, at the $95 \%$ confidence level, between public and private schools.
- Education levels: Students at the upper secondary education are compared to students at the lower secondary education. If the difference is statistically significant at the $95 \%$ confidence levels, both figures are marked in bold.
- School location: For the purpose of significance tests, "schools located in a small town" and "schools located in a town" are jointly considered to form a single group. Figures for "schools located in a city or large city" are marked in bold in data tables presented in Annex B of this report if the difference with this middle category ("schools located in a small town" and "schools located in a town") is significant at the $95 \%$ confidence levels. In turn, figures for "schools located in a village, hamlet, or rural area" are marked in bold if the difference with this middle category is significant. Differences between the extreme categories were not tested for significance.


## Change in the performance per unit of the index

For many tables, the difference in student performance per unit of the index shown was calculated. Figures in bold indicate that the differences are statistically significantly different from zero at the $95 \%$ confidence level.

## Relative risk or increased likelihood

Figures in bold in the data tables presented in Annex B of this report indicate that the relative risk is statistically significantly different from 1 at the $95 \%$ confidence level. To compute statistical significance around the value of 1 (the null hypothesis), the relative-risk statistic is assumed to follow a log-normal distribution, rather than a normal distribution, under the null hypothesis.

## Attributable risk or population relevance

Figures in bold in the data tables presented in Annex B of this report indicate that the attributable risk is statistically significantly different from 0 at the $95 \%$ confidence level.

## Standard errors in statistics estimated from multilevel models

For statistics based on multilevel models (such as the estimates of variance components and regression coefficients from two-level regression models) the standard errors are not estimated with the usual replication method which accounts for stratification and sampling rates from finite populations. Instead, standard errors are "model-based": their computation assumes that schools, and students within schools, are sampled at random (with sampling probabilities reflected in school and student weights) from a theoretical, infinite population of schools and students which complies with the model's parametric assumptions.

The standard error for the estimated index of inclusion is calculated by deriving an approximate distribution for it from the (modelbased) standard errors for the variance components, using the delta-method.

## Standard errors in trend analyses of performance: Link error

Standard errors for performance trend estimates had to be adjusted because the equating procedure that allows scores in different PISA assessments to be compared introduces a form of random error that is related to performance changes on the link items. These more conservative standard errors (larger than standard errors that were estimated before the introduction of the link error) reflect not only the measurement precision and sampling variation as for the usual PISA results, but also the link error (see Annex A5 for a technical discussion of the link error).

Link items represent only a subset of all items used to derive PISA scores. If different items were chosen to equate PISA scores over time, the comparison of performance for a group of students across time could vary. As a result, standard errors for the estimates of the change over time in mathematics, reading or science performance of a particular group (e.g. a country or economy, a region, boys, girls, students with an immigrant background, students without an immigrant background, socio-economically advantaged students, students in public schools, etc.) include the link error in addition to the sampling and imputation error commonly added to estimates in performance for a particular year. Because the equating procedure adds uncertainty to the position in the distribution (a change in the intercept) but does not result in any change in the variance of a distribution, standard errors for location-invariant estimates do not
include the link error. Location-invariant estimates include, for example, estimates for variances, regression coefficients for student- or school-level covariates, and correlation coefficients.

Figures in bold in the data tables for trends in performance presented in Annex B of this report indicate that the the change in performance for that particular group is statistically significantly different from 0 at the $95 \%$ confidence level. The standard errors used to calculate the statistical significance of the reported trend include the link error.

## ANNEX A4

## QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality assurance procedures were implemented in all parts of PISA 2012, as was done for all previous PISA surveys.
The consistent quality and linguistic equivalence of the PISA 2012 assessment instruments were facilitated by providing countries with equivalent source versions of the assessment instruments in English and French and requiring countries (other than those assessing students in English and French) to prepare and consolidate two independent translations using both source versions. Precise translation and adaptation guidelines were supplied, also including instructions for selecting and training the translators. For each country, the translation and format of the assessment instruments (including test materials, marking guides, questionnaires and manuals) were verified by expert translators appointed by the PISA Consortium before they were used in the PISA 2012 Field Trial and Main Study. These translators' mother tongue was the language of instruction in the country concerned and they were knowledgeable about education systems. For further information on the PISA translation procedures, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

The survey was implemented through standardised procedures. The PISA Consortium provided comprehensive manuals that explained the implementation of the survey, including precise instructions for the work of School Co-ordinators and scripts for Test Administrators to use during the assessment sessions. Proposed adaptations to survey procedures, or proposed modifications to the assessment session script, were submitted to the PISA Consortium for approval prior to verification. The PISA Consortium then verified the national translation and adaptation of these manuals.

To establish the credibility of PISA as valid and unbiased and to encourage uniformity in administering the assessment sessions, Test Administrators in participating countries were selected using the following criteria: it was required that the Test Administrator not be the reading, mathematics or science instructor of any students in the sessions he or she would administer for PISA; it was recommended that the Test Administrator not be a member of the staff of any school where he or she would administer for PISA; and it was considered preferable that the Test Administrator not be a member of the staff of any school in the PISA sample. Participating countries organised an in-person training session for Test Administrators.

Participating countries and economies were required to ensure that: Test Administrators worked with the School Co-ordinator to prepare the assessment session, including updating student tracking forms and identifying excluded students; no extra time was given for the cognitive items (while it was permissible to give extra time for the student questionnaire); no instrument was administered before the two one-hour parts of the cognitive session; Test Administrators recorded the student participation status on the student tracking forms and filled in a Session Report Form; no cognitive instrument was permitted to be photocopied; no cognitive instrument could be viewed by school staff before the assessment session; and Test Administrators returned the material to the national centre immediately after the assessment sessions.

National Project Managers were encouraged to organise a follow-up session when more than $15 \%$ of the PISA sample was not able to attend the original assessment session.

National Quality Monitors from the PISA Consortium visited all national centres to review data-collection procedures. Finally, School Quality Monitors from the PISA Consortium visited a sample of seven schools during the assessment. For further information on the field operations, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

Marking procedures were designed to ensure consistent and accurate application of the marking guides outlined in the PISA Operations Manuals. National Project Managers were required to submit proposed modifications to these procedures to the Consortium for approval. Reliability studies to analyse the consistency of marking were implemented.

Software specially designed for PISA facilitated data entry, detected common errors during data entry, and facilitated the process of data cleaning. Training sessions familiarised National Project Managers with these procedures.

For a description of the quality assurance procedures applied in PISA and in the results, see the PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming).

The results of adjudication showed that the PISA Technical Standards were fully met in all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012, with the exception of Albania. Albania submitted parental occupation data that was incomplete and appeared inaccurate, since there was over-use of a narrow range of occupations. It was not possible to resolve these issues during the course of data cleaning, and as a result neither parental occupation data nor any indices which depend on this data are included in the international dataset. Results for Albania are omitted from any analyses which depend on these indices.

## ANNEX A5

## TECHNICAL DETAILS OF TRENDS ANALYSES

## Comparing mathematics, reading and science performance across PISA cycles

The PISA 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2012 assessments use the same mathematics performance scale, which means that score points on this scale are directly comparable over time. The same is true for the reading performance scale used since PISA 2000 and the science performance scale used since PISA 2006. The comparability of scores across time is possible because of the use of link items that are common across assessments and can be used in the equating procedure to align performance scales. The items that are common across assessments are a subset of the total items that make up the assessment because PISA progressively renews its pool of items. As a result, out of a total of 110 items in the PISA 2012 mathematics assessment, 84 are linked to 2003 items, 48 to 2006 items and 35 to 2009 items. The number of PISA 2012 items linked to the PISA 2003 assessment is larger than the number linked to the PISA 2006 or the PISA 2009 assessments because mathematics was a major domain in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. In PISA 2006 and PISA 2009, mathematics was a minor domain and all the mathematics items included in these assessments were link items. The PISA 2012 Technical Report (OECD, forthcoming) provides the technical details on equating the PISA 2012 mathematics scale for trends purposes.

## Link error

Standard errors for performance trend estimates had to be adjusted because the equating procedure that allows scores in different PISA assessments to be compared introduces a form of random error that is related to performance changes on the link items. These more conservative standard errors (larger than standard errors that were estimated before the introduction of the link error) reflect not only the measurement precision and sampling variation as for the usual PISA results, but also the link error provided in Table A5.1.

Link items represent only a subset of all items used to derive PISA scores. If different items were chosen to equate PISA scores over time, the comparison of performance for a group of students across time could vary. As a result, standard errors for the estimates of the change over time in mathematics, reading or science performance of a particular group (e.g. a country or economy, a region, boys, girls, students with an immigrant background, students without an immigrant background, socio-economically advantaged students, students in public schools, etc.) include the link error in addition to the sampling and imputation error commonly added to estimates in performance for a particular year. Because the equating procedure adds uncertainty to the position in the distribution (a change in the intercept) but does not result in any change in the variance of a distribution, standard errors for location-invariant estimates do not include the link error. Location-invariant estimates include, for example, estimates for variances, regression coefficients for student- or school-level covariates, and correlation coefficients.

## Link error for scores between two PISA assessments

The following equations describe how link errors between two PISA assessments are calculated. Suppose we have $L$ score points in $K$ units. Use $i$ to index items in a unit and $j$ to index units so that $\hat{\mu}_{i j}^{y}$ is the estimated difficulty of item $i$ in unit $j$ for year $y$, and let for example to compare PISA 2006 and PISA 2003:

$$
c_{i j}=\hat{\mu}_{i j}^{2006}-\hat{\mu}_{i j}^{2003}
$$

The size (total number of score points) of unit $j$ is $m_{j}$ so that:

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{K} m_{j}=L
$$

and

$$
\bar{m}=\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} m_{j}
$$

Further let:

$$
c_{. j}=\frac{1}{m_{j}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{j}} c_{i j}
$$

and

$$
\bar{c}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{m_{j}} c_{i j}
$$

then the link error, taking clustering into account, is as follows:

$$
\text { error }_{2006,2003}=\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{K} m_{j}^{2}\left(c_{. j}-\bar{c}\right)^{2}}{K(K-1) \bar{m}^{2}}}
$$

This approach for estimating the link errors was used in PISA 2006, PISA 2009 and PISA 2012. The link errors for comparisons of PISA 2012 results with previous assessments are shown in Table A5.1.
[Part 1/1]
Table A5.1 Link error for comparisons of performance between PISA 2012 and previous assessments

| Lable A5.1 | Link error for comparisons of performance between PISA 2012 and previous assessments |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparison | Mathematics | Reading |  |  |
| PISA 2000 to PISA 2012 |  | 5.923 |  |  |
| PISA 2003 to PISA 2012 | 1.931 | 5.604 |  |  |
| PISA 2006 to PISA 2012 | 2.084 | 5.580 | 3.512 |  |
| PISA 2009 to PISA 2012 | 2.294 | 2.602 | 2.006 |  |

Note: Comparisons between PISA 2012 scores and previous assessments can only be made to when the subject first became a major domain. As a result, comparisons in mathematics performance between PISA 2012 and PISA 2000 are not possible, nor are comparisons in science performance between PISA 2012 and PISA 2000 or PISA 2003.


## Comparisons of performance: Difference between two assessments

To evaluate the evolution of performance, analyses report the change in performance between two cycles. Comparisons between two assessments (e.g. a country's/economy's change in performance between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 or the change in performance of a subgroup) are calculated as:

$$
\Delta_{2012-t}=P I S A_{2012}-P I S A_{t}
$$

where $\Delta_{2012-t}$ is the difference in performance between PISA 2012 and a previous PISA assessment, where $t$ can take any of the following values: 2000, 2003, 2006 or 2009. PISA 2012 is the mathematics, reading or science score observed in PISA 2012, and PISA ${ }_{t}$ is the mathematics, reading or science score observed in a previous assessment (2000, 2003, 2006 or 2009). The standard error of the change in performance $\sigma\left(\Delta_{2012-t}\right)$ is:

$$
\sigma\left(\Delta_{2012-t}\right)=\sqrt{\sigma_{2012}^{2}+\sigma_{t}^{2}+\text { error }_{2012, t}^{2}}
$$

where $\sigma_{2012}$ is the standard error observed for $P I S A_{2012}, \sigma_{t}$ is the standard error observed for $P I S A_{t}$ and error ${ }_{2012, t}$ is the link error for comparisons of mathematics, reading or science performance between the PISA 2012 assessment and a previous $(t)$ assessment. The value for error ${ }_{2012, t}$ is shown in Table A5.1.

## Comparing items and non-performance scales across PISA cycles

To gather information about students' and schools' characteristics, PISA asks both students and schools to complete a background questionnaire. In PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 several questions were left untouched, allowing for a comparison of responses to these questions over time. In this report, only questions that retained the same wording were used for trends analyses. Questions with subtle word changes or questions with major word changes were not compared across time because it is impossible to discern whether observed changes in the response are due to changes in the construct they are measuring or to changes in the way the construct is being measured.

Also, as described in Annex A1, questionnaire items in PISA are used to construct indices. Whenever the questions used in the construction of indices remains intact in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012, the corresponding indices are compared. Two types of indices are used in PISA: simple indices and scale indices.

Simple indices recode a set of responses to questionnaire items. For trends analyses, the values observed in PISA 2003 are compared directly to PISA 2012, just as simple responses to questionnaire items are. This is the case of indices like student-teacher ratio and ability grouping in mathematics.

Scale indices, on the other hand, imply WLE estimates which require rescaling in order to be comparable across PISA cycles. Scale indices, like the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status, the index of sense of belonging, the index of attitudes towards school, the index of intrinsic motivation to learn mathematics, the index of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics, the index of mathematics self-efficacy, the index of mathematics self-concept, the index of anxiety towards mathematics, the index of teacher shortage, the index of quality of physical infrastructure, the index of quality of educational resources, the index of disciplinary climate, the index of student-teacher relations, the index of teacher morale, the index of student-related factors affecting school climate, and the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate, were scaled in PISA 2012 to have an OECD mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 . In PISA 2003 these same scales were scaled to have an OECD average of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 . Because they are on different scales, values reported in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) cannot be compared with those reported in this volume. To make these scale indices comparable, values for 2003 have been rescaled to the 2012 scale, using the PISA 2012 parameter estimates.

To evaluate change in these items and scales, analyses report the change in the estimate between two assessments, usually PISA 2003 and PISA 2012. Comparisons between two assessments (e.g. a country's/economy's change index of anxiety towards mathematics between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 or the change in this index for a subgroup) is calculated as:

$$
\Delta_{2012, t}=P I S A_{2012}-P I S A_{t}
$$

where $\Delta_{2012, t}$ is the difference in the index between PISA 2012 and a previous assessment, PISA 2012 is the index value observed in PISA 2012, and PISA $A_{t}$ is the index value observed in a previous assessment (2000,2003, 2006 or 2009). The standard error of the change in performance $\sigma\left(\Delta_{2012-\mathrm{t}}\right)$ is:

$$
\sigma\left(\Delta_{2012-t}\right)=\sqrt{\sigma_{2012}^{2}+\sigma_{t}^{2}}
$$

where $\sigma_{2012}$ is the standard error observed for $P I S A_{2012}$ and $\sigma_{t}$ is the standard error observed for $P I S A_{t}$. These comparisons are based on an identical set of items; there is no uncertainty related to the choice of items for equating purposes, so no link error is needed.

Although only scale indices that use the same items in PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are valid for trend comparisons, this does not imply that PISA 2012 indices that include exactly the same items as 2003 as well as new questionnaire items cannot be compared with PISA 2003 indices that included a smaller pool of items. In such cases, for example the index of sense of belonging, trend analyses were conducted by treating as missing in PISA 2003 items that were asked in the context of PISA 2012 but not in the PISA 2003 student questionnaire. This means that while the full set of information was used to scale the sense of belonging index in 2012, the PISA 2003 sense of belonging index was scaled under the assumption that if the 2012 items that were missing in 2003 had been asked in 2003, the overall index and index variation would have remained the same as those that were observed on common 2003 items. This is a tenable assumption inasmuch as in both PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 the questionnaire items used to construct the scale hold as an underlying factor in the construction of the scale.

## OECD average

Throughout this report, the OECD average is used as a benchmark. It is calculated as the average across OECD countries, weighting each country equally. Some OECD countries did not participate in certain assessments, other OECD countries do not have comparable results for some assessments, others did not include certain questions in their questionnaires or changed them substantially from assessment to assessment. For this reason in trends tables and figures, the OECD average is reported as assessment-specific, that is, it includes only those countries for which there is comparable information in that particular assessment. This way, the 2003 OECD average includes only those OECD countries that have comparable information from the 2003 assessment, even if the results it refers to the PISA 2012 assessment and more countries have comparable information. This restriction allows for valid comparisons of the OECD average over time.
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## Notes regarding Cyprus

Note by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".
Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

## A note regarding Israel

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

## ANNEX B1

## RESULTS FOR COUNTRIES AND ECONOMIES

[Part 1/1]
Relationship between education outcomes and selecting and grouping students
Table IV.1.1 System-level correlations

|  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Vertical stratification | Standard deviation of grade levels that 15-year-old students attend | -0.29 | $(0.09)^{1}$ | -0.31 | $(0.08){ }^{1}$ | 0.56 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.03) | 0.38 | (0.03) |
|  | Standard deviation of age of entry into primary school | -0.21 | (0.24) | -0.32 | (0.07) | 0.06 | (0.72) | 0.11 | (0.55) | -0.17 | (0.34) | -0.14 | (0.44) |
|  | Percentage of students who repeated one or more grades | -0.14 | (0.43) | -0.25 | (0.16) | 0.39 | (0.02) | 0.45 | (0.01) | 0.33 | (0.06) | 0.38 | (0.03) |
| Horizontal stratification (between schools) | Number of school types or distinct education programmes available for 15-year-olds | 0.13 | (0.47) | 0.10 | (0.58) | 0.23 | (0.18) | 0.26 | (0.15) | 0.62 | (0.00) | 0.65 | (0.00) |
|  | Percentage of students enrolled in a programme with a pre-vocational or vocational curriculum | 0.00 | (0.98) | 0.04 | (0.84) | 0.02 | (0.93) | 0.00 | (0.99) | 0.50 | (0.00) | 0.50 | (0.00) |
|  | Number of years between age of selection and age 15 | 0.11 | (0.55) | 0.10 | (0.57) | 0.31 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | 0.32 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | 0.61 | (0.00) | 0.63 | (0.00) |
|  | Percentage of students in selective schools | 0.22 | (0.21) | 0.20 | (0.28) | 0.13 | (0.46) | 0.15 | (0.41) | 0.54 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.00) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs | -0.20 | (0.26) | -0.17 | (0.33) | 0.30 | (0.09) | 0.29 | (0.10) | 0.48 | (0.00) | 0.47 | (0.01) |
| Horizontal stratification (within schools) | Percentage of students in schools that group students by ability for all mathematics classes | -0.06 | (0.73) | -0.07 | (0.71) | -0.10 | (0.59) | -0.10 | (0.59) | -0.23 | (0.18) | -0.24 | (0.19) |
|  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before ac for GD | counting /capita | After acco for GDP | counting /capita | Before a for GD | counting /capita | After ac for GD | ounting capita | Before a for GD | counting <br> /capita | After ac for GD | counting /capita |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | $p$-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Vertical stratification | Standard deviation of grade levels that 15-year-old students attend | -0.34 | (0.01) | -0.36 | (0.00) | 0.25 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.04) | 0.16 | (0.22) | 0.14 | (0.26) |
|  | Standard deviation of age of entry into primary school | -0.22 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | -0.32 | (0.01) | 0.02 | (0.85) | 0.08 | (0.54) | -0.05 | (0.68) | -0.05 | (0.67) |
|  | Percentage of students who repeated one or more grades | -0.26 | $(0.04)^{1}$ | -0.34 | (0.01) | 0.22 | (0.09) | 0.25 | (0.05) | 0.16 | (0.21) | 0.17 | (0.18) |
| Horizontal stratification (between schools) | Number of school types or distinct education programmes available for 15-year-olds | 0.04 | (0.76) | 0.04 | (0.74) | 0.19 | (0.15) | 0.20 | (0.13) | 0.48 | (0.00) | 0.49 | (0.00) |
|  | Percentage of students enrolled in a programme with a pre-vocational or vocational curriculum | -0.01 | (0.94) | 0.09 | (0.49) | 0.05 | (0.71) | -0.01 | (0.92) | 0.43 | (0.00) | 0.42 | (0.00) |
|  | Number of years between age of selection and age 15 | 0.15 | (0.24) | 0.12 | (0.35) | 0.37 | (0.00) | 0.42 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.00) | 0.61 | (0.00) |
|  | Percentage of students in selective schools | 0.18 | (0.15) | 0.15 | (0.25) | -0.13 | (0.30) | -0.09 | (0.48) | 0.28 | (0.03) | 0.29 | (0.02) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs | -0.19 | (0.13) | -0.19 | (0.14) | 0.04 | (0.76) | 0.05 | (0.70) | 0.26 | (0.04) | 0.23 | (0.08) |
| Horizontal stratification (within schools) | Percentage of students in schools that group students by ability for all mathematics classes | -0.26 | (0.04) | -0.25 | (0.04) | -0.15 | (0.22) | -0.17 | (0.18) | -0.20 | (0.11) | -0.23 | (0.07) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are in bold.

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a superscript 1 appears in the cell.
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[Part 1/1]
Relationship between education outcomes and resources invested in education
Table IV.1.2 System-level correlations

|  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Financial resources | Cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15 | 0.41 | (0.02) | 0.32 | $(0.08)^{1}$ | -0.19 | (0.30) | -0.13 | (0.49) | -0.18 | (0.31) | -0.12 | (0.51) |
|  | Teachers' salaries relative to GDP/capita ${ }^{2}$ | 0.32 | (0.08) | 0.31 | (0.10) | -0.05 | (0.77) | -0.02 | (0.91) | 0.08 | (0.66) | 0.11 | (0.57) |
| Human resources | Percentage of teachers with university-level qualifications | -0.20 | (0.28) | -0.15 | (0.41) | -0.04 | (0.84) | -0.07 | (0.70) | -0.26 | (0.16) | -0.30 | (0.10) |
|  | Average index of teacher shortage | -0.27 | (0.13) | -0.41 | $(0.02)^{1}$ | -0.14 | (0.42) | -0.10 | (0.57) | 0.08 | (0.66) | 0.13 | (0.48) |
|  | Student-teacher ratio | -0.48 | $(0.00)^{1}$ | -0.42 | $(0.02)^{1}$ | -0.03 | (0.88) | -0.08 | (0.64) | -0.01 | (0.94) | -0.07 | (0.71) |
|  | Percentage of mathematics teachers at the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months | 0.06 | (0.75) | 0.01 | (0.97) | -0.11 | (0.52) | -0.09 | (0.61) | -0.28 | (0.10) | -0.27 | (0.13) |
| Material resources | Average index of quality of physical infrastructure | 0.26 | (0.13) | 0.31 | $(0.08)^{1}$ | 0.02 | (0.93) | 0.00 | (0.99) | -0.12 | (0.51) | -0.13 | (0.46) |
|  | Average index of quality of schools ${ }^{\prime}$ educational resources | 0.63 | (0.00) | 0.58 | (0.00) | -0.02 | (0.92) | 0.04 | (0.81) | 0.13 | (0.46) | 0.20 | (0.26) |
| Time resources | Average learning time in regular mathematics lessons | -0.32 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | -0.30 | $(0.09)^{1}$ | 0.05 | (0.80) | 0.03 | (0.89) | -0.25 | (0.15) | -0.28 | (0.12) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools offering after-school lessons in mathematics | 0.15 | (0.39) | 0.17 | (0.35) | 0.20 | (0.25) | 0.20 | (0.25) | 0.22 | (0.20) | 0.22 | (0.21) |
|  | Average number of hours per week spent on homework or other study set by teachers, all school subjects combined | -0.03 | (0.85) | -0.04 | (0.80) | -0.13 | (0.48) | -0.12 | (0.49) | -0.12 | (0.50) | -0.12 | (0.51) |
|  | Average index of creative extracurricular activities at school | 0.20 | (0.26) | 0.18 | (0.32) | -0.02 | (0.91) | 0.00 | (0.98) | 0.02 | (0.91) | 0.03 | (0.85) |
|  | Average index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school | 0.13 | (0.45) | 0.27 | (0.14) | 0.23 | (0.19) | 0.19 | (0.29) | 0.16 | (0.38) | 0.12 | (0.51) |
|  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education for more than one year | 0.36 | $(0.04)^{1}$ | 0.30 | $(0.09)^{1}$ | -0.07 | (0.68) | -0.04 | (0.84) | 0.17 | (0.34) | 0.21 | (0.23) |


|  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Financial resources | Cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15 | 0.55 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.52) | -0.15 | (0.31) | -0.10 | (0.48) | -0.13 | (0.38) | -0.10 | (0.50) |
|  | Teachers' salaries relative to GDP/capita ${ }^{2}$ | 0.02 | (0.91) | -0.05 | (0.74) | -0.24 | (0.09) ${ }^{1}$ | -0.21 | (0.14) | -0.08 | (0.60) | -0.05 | (0.73) |
| Human resources | Percentage of teachers with university-level qualifications | 0.14 | (0.28) | 0.08 | (0.52) | -0.16 | (0.22) | -0.13 | (0.32) | -0.26 | $(0.04)^{1}$ | -0.23 | $(0.08)^{1}$ |
|  | Average index of teacher shortage | -0.14 | (0.25) | -0.17 | (0.18) | -0.13 | (0.30) | -0.13 | (0.30) | -0.06 | (0.63) | -0.06 | (0.62) |
|  | Student-teacher ratio | -0.37 | (0.00) | -0.26 | $(0.04)^{1}$ | 0.09 | (0.50) | -0.03 | (0.83) | 0.00 | (1.00) | -0.06 | (0.66) |
|  | Percentage of mathematics teachers at the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months | 0.10 | (0.44) | 0.02 | (0.89) | -0.20 | (0.11) | -0.17 | (0.18) | -0.23 | (0.07) | -0.20 | (0.12) |
| Material resources | Average index of quality of physical infrastructure | 0.45 | (0.00) | 0.31 | $(0.01)^{1}$ | -0.01 | (0.96) | 0.13 | (0.32) | -0.05 | (0.67) | 0.02 | (0.86) |
|  | Average index of quality of schools' educational resources | 0.66 | (0.00) | 0.51 | (0.00) | -0.10 | (0.44) | 0.15 | (0.24) | 0.04 | (0.74) | 0.22 | (0.08) |
| Time resources | Average learning time in regular mathematics lessons | 0.02 | (0.85) | -0.07 | (0.60) | -0.10 | (0.46) | -0.06 | (0.65) | -0.27 | (0.03) | -0.25 | (0.05) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools offering after-school lessons in mathematics | 0.10 | (0.45) | 0.13 | (0.33) | -0.12 | (0.35) | -0.14 | (0.27) | -0.04 | (0.78) | -0.03 | (0.83) |
|  | Average number of hours per week spent on homework or other study set by teachers, all school subjects combined | 0.31 | $(0.01)^{1}$ | 0.38 | $(0.00)^{1}$ | -0.07 | (0.56) | -0.11 | (0.41) | -0.12 | (0.36) | -0.11 | (0.38) |
|  | Average index of creative extracurricular activities at school | 0.33 | (0.01) | 0.26 | (0.04) | -0.14 | (0.26) | -0.08 | (0.51) | -0.09 | (0.48) | -0.05 | (0.68) |
|  | Average index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school | 0.08 | (0.51) | 0.14 | (0.26) | -0.12 | (0.35) | -0.16 | (0.20) | -0.11 | (0.38) | -0.11 | (0.39) |
|  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education for more than one year | 0.64 | (0.00) | 0.57 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.46) | 0.23 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | 0.19 | (0.12) | 0.28 | (0.03) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) are in bold

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a superscript 1 appears in the cell.
2. Weighted average of upper and lower secondary school teachers. The average is computed by weighting teachers' salaries for upper and lower secondary school according to the respective 15 -year-old students' enrolment (for countries and economies with valid information on both the upper and lower secondary levels).
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[Part 1/1]
Relationship between education outcomes and allocation of resources
Table IV.1.3 System-level correlations
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[Part 1/1]
Relationship between education outcomes and school governance, assessment and accountability policies
Table IV.1.4 System-level correlations

|  |  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  |  | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| School governance | School autonomy | Average index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment | 0.49 | (0.00) | 0.58 | (0.00) | -0.08 | (0.63) | -0.11 | (0.54) | 0.14 | (0.44) | 0.12 | (0.52) |
|  |  | Average index of school responsibility for resource allocation | -0.01 | (0.95) | 0.00 | (1.00) | 0.12 | (0.50) | 0.12 | (0.52) | 0.14 | (0.44) | 0.13 | (0.46) |
|  | School competition | Percentage of students in schools that compete with other schools in the same area | -0.02 | (0.93) | 0.07 | (0.71) | 0.26 | (0.13) | 0.24 | (0.18) | 0.33 | $(0.06)^{1}$ | 0.31 | $(0.08)^{1}$ |
|  |  | Percentage of students in private schools | 0.14 | (0.44) | 0.11 | (0.53) | 0.06 | (0.72) | 0.08 | (0.65) | 0.18 | (0.32) | 0.19 | (0.28) |
| Assessment and accountability policies | Percentage of students in schools that use achievement data to: | Post achievement data publicly | -0.21 | (0.23) | -0.15 | (0.42) | 0.09 | (0.61) | 0.06 | (0.76) | 0.01 | (0.96) | -0.03 | (0.88) |
|  |  | Have their progress tracked by administrative authorities | -0.34 | (0.05) | -0.31 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.73) | 0.04 | (0.83) | -0.30 | (0.09) | -0.33 | (0.06) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools that: | Seek written feed-back from students for quality assurance and improvement | 0.16 | (0.36) | 0.34 | (0.05) | -0.22 | (0.20) | -0.31 | (0.07) | -0.05 | (0.80) | -0.11 | (0.53) |
|  |  | Mentor teachers for quality assurance and improvement | 0.24 | (0.17) | 0.26 | (0.14) | -0.15 | (0.40) | -0.15 | (0.40) | 0.03 | (0.88) | 0.02 | (0.89) |
|  |  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  |  | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | $p$-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | $p$-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | $p$-value |
| School governance | School autonomy | Average index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment | 0.38 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.00) | -0.13 | (0.29) | -0.11 | (0.38) | -0.04 | (0.77) | -0.01 | (0.93) |
|  |  | Average index of school responsibility for resource allocation | 0.14 | (0.26) | 0.10 | (0.44) | -0.05 | (0.67) | -0.03 | (0.81) | -0.04 | (0.73) | -0.02 | (0.85) |
|  | School competition | Percentage of students in schools that compete with other schools in the same area | 0.12 | (0.36) | 0.19 | (0.14) | 0.11 | (0.39) | 0.06 | (0.65) | 0.10 | (0.43) | 0.12 | (0.34) |
|  |  | Percentage of students in private schools | 0.17 | (0.19) | 0.01 | (0.93) | -0.22 | (0.09) ${ }^{1}$ | -0.15 | (0.23) | -0.10 | (0.43) | -0.03 | (0.82) |
| Assessment and accountability policies | Percentage of students in schools that use achievement data to: | Post achievement data publicly | -0.03 | (0.83) | 0.02 | (0.90) | 0.00 | (0.98) | -0.04 | (0.79) | -0.04 | (0.77) | -0.05 | (0.67) |
|  |  | Have their progress tracked by administrative authorities | -0.36 | (0.00) | -0.32 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.98) | -0.07 | (0.61) | -0.28 | (0.02) | -0.31 | (0.01) |
|  | Percentage of students in schools that: | Seek written feed-back from students for quality assurance and improvement | 0.13 | (0.32) | 0.20 | (0.11) | -0.26 | (0.04) | -0.29 | (0.02) | -0.13 | (0.29) | -0.18 | (0.15) |
|  |  | Mentor teachers for quality assurance and improvement | 0.03 | (0.79) | 0.05 | (0.72) | -0.26 | (0.04) | -0.27 | (0.04) | -0.07 | (0.59) | -0.07 | (0.57) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are in bold.

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a superscript 1 appears in the cell.
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[Part 1/1]
Relationship between education outcomes and the learning environment
Table IV.1.5 System-level correlations

|  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Student truancy | Percentage of students who arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.44 | (0.01) | 0.07 | (0.71) | 0.01 | (0.93) | -0.30 | (0.08) | -0.38 | (0.03) |
|  | Percentage of students who skipped some lessons or a day of school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test | -0.48 | (0.00) | -0.40 | (0.02) | -0.05 | (0.77) | -0.12 | (0.52) | -0.15 | (0.41) | -0.22 | (0.23) |
|  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mathematics performance |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students |  |  |  | Variation in mathematics performance explained by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students and schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  | Before accounting for GDP/capita |  | After accounting for GDP/capita |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | $p$-value | Partial corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Partial corr. | p-value |
| Student truancy | Percentage of students who arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.43 | (0.00) | 0.31 | (0.01) | 0.22 | $(0.09)^{1}$ | -0.04 | (0.74) | -0.11 | (0.41) |
|  | Percentage of students who skipped some lessons or a day of school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test | -0.52 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.00) | 0.06 | (0.65) | -0.08 | (0.56) | -0.11 | (0.40) | -0.19 | (0.15) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are in bold.

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a superscript 1 appears in the cell.
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Table IV.1.6 Cost of grade repetition

|  |  | Number of 15 -year-old students who have repeated a grade at least once in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary schools | Direct costs | Opportunity costs |  | Total costs (direct + opportunity costs) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Costs to systems to provide one additional year of education to repeaters | Assuming that repeaters attain at most ISCED 2 (i.e. using annual labour costs for ISCED 0/1/2 for 25-64 year-olds and unemployment rate for "below upper secondary") |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of 15-year-old students who enter the labour market at least one year later because of grade repetition (after adjusting unemployment rates) | Costs to systems by delaying students' entrance to the labour market by one additional year | Total annual costs | Total annual costs per repeater | Total annual costs, relative to total expenditure on primary and secondary education |
|  |  | (students) | (USD, PPPs) | (students) | (USD, PPPs) | (USD, PPPs) | (USD, PPPs) | (\%) |
|  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|  | Australia |  | 18775 | 184044685 | 17671 | 696050444 | 880095129 | 46875 | 2.2 |
| 0 | Austria | 9800 | 114267363 | 9105 | 412259639 | 526527002 | 53729 | 4.3 |
|  | Belgium | 42564 | 413403011 | 37431 | 1668728052 | 2082131063 | 48918 | 11.5 |
|  | Canada | 27893 | 224253077 | 24624 | 942393439 | 1166646516 | 41825 | 2.3 |
|  | Chile ${ }^{1}$ | 57746 | 186232081 | 55203 | m | 186232081 | 3225 | 1.8 |
|  | Czech Republic | 4028 | 21957517 | 3159 | 63733751 | 85691268 | 21277 | 1.1 |
|  | Denmark | 3116 | 34198882 | 2838 | 124706884 | 158905766 | 50994 | 1.5 |
|  | Estonia | 408 | 2264828 | 300 | 5279391 | 7544219 | 18494 | 0.0 |
|  | Finland | 2296 | 19797661 | 2036 | 88688074 | 108485735 | 47253 | 1.4 |
|  | France | 198899 | 1662432344 | 173300 | 6337531130 | 7999963475 | 40221 | 8.8 |
|  | Germany | 153407 | 1239464945 | 132076 | 5871727799 | 7111192744 | 46355 | 7.3 |
|  | Greece | 4347 | m | 3603 | 76183724 | m | m | m |
|  | Hungary | 9819 | 45755284 | 7550 | 112804733 | 158560017 | 16148 | m |
|  | Iceland | 48 | 454094 | 45 | 1241518 | 1695611 | 35095 | 0.3 |
|  | Ireland | 4667 | 43459946 | 3654 | 172792186 | 216252132 | 46334 | 2.5 |
|  | Israel | 2059 | 11741465 | 1909 | 35467449 | 47208914 | 22923 | 0.5 |
|  | Italy | 88929 | 750706413 | 80586 | 3444472862 | 4195179275 | 47174 | 6.7 |
|  | Japan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | Korea | 21997 | 151857955 | 21413 | 609568404 | 761426358 | 34616 | 1.3 |
|  | Luxembourg ${ }^{1}$ | 1907 | 37683413 | 1791 | m | 37683413 | 19760 | 2.5 |
|  | Mexico ${ }^{1}$ | 205280 | 490879781 | 197080 | m | 490879781 | 2391 | 0.7 |
|  | Netherlands | 54202 | 515310514 | 51254 | 2567429123 | 3082739637 | 56875 | 10.9 |
|  | New Zealand | 2869 | 20270349 | 2682 | 77367987 | 97638336 | 34031 | 1.5 |
|  | Norway | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | Poland | 15758 | 90836603 | 13096 | 128301062 | 219137665 | 13906 | 0.8 |
|  | Portugal | 32903 | 231538476 | 28524 | 500500355 | 732038831 | 22248 | 6.9 |
|  | Slovak Republic | 4133 | 21969954 | 2508 | 46979269 | 68949223 | 16683 | 1.8 |
|  | Slovenia | 619 | 5679364 | 540 | 10123653 | 15803017 | 25539 | 0.7 |
|  | Spain | 122893 | 1009912235 | 90434 | 2790294903 | 3800207139 | 30923 | 7.9 |
|  | Sweden | 3762 | 36050977 | 3357 | 157440781 | 193491758 | 51434 | 1.3 |
|  | Switzerland ${ }^{1}$ | 15844 | 201726074 | 14643 | m | 201726074 | 12732 | 1.3 |
|  | Turkey ${ }^{1}$ | 123017 | 243831343 | 112629 | m | 243831343 | 1982 | 0.8 |
|  | United Kingdom | 18481 | 181154077 | 16447 | 554619508 | 735773585 | 39813 | 0.7 |
|  | United States | 469032 | 5438963060 | 393187 | 14037167584 | 19476130643 | 41524 | 3.4 |
|  | Brazil ${ }^{2}$ | 812712 | 2175263001 | 775658 | 4588252909 | 6763515910 | 8322 | m |
| 辰 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. In Chile, Luxembourg, Mexico, Switzerland and Turkey, the total costs are underestimated as the annual labour costs are not available in Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators, Table A10.2 and the opportunity costs cannot be computed
2. In Brazil, gross annual full time earnings are used, as annual labour costs are not available in Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators, Table A10.2

Source: OECD, PISA 2012 Database, Tables IV.2.2 and IV.3.1, Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (Tables A10.2 and X2.1), Education at a Glance 2013: OECD
Indicators (Tables A5.4a and X2.2) and OECD.stat
StatLink 泀ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
[Part 1/2]
Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by school characteristics combined


1. Multilevel regression model consists of the student and school levels.
2. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the variables of demographic and socio-economic background shown in Table IV.1.12c.
3. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the school-level variables shown in Table IV.1.12b.
4. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the variables of demographic and socio-economic background and on the school-level variables shown in Table IV.1.12c,

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 侢istl http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
[Part 2/2]
Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by school characteristics combined
Table IV.1.12a Within- and between-school variations

|  | Within-school variance expressed as a percentage of the average of within-school variance in student performance in mathematics across OECD countries |  |  |  | Between-school variance expressed as a percentage of the average of between-school variance in student performance in mathematics across OECD countries |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background | Solely accounted for by schools characteristics | Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and schools' characteristics |  | Solely accounted for by students ${ }^{\prime}$ and schools' socio-economic and demographic background | Solely accounted for by schools' characteristics | Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and schools' characteristics |  |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Q Australia | 4.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 75.1 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 14.6 | 8.1 |
| A Austria | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46.6 | 5.5 | 8.5 | 27.7 | 6.3 |
| - Belgium | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 59.2 | 1.8 | 12.5 | 42.5 | 5.3 |
| Canada | 4.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 70.3 | 1.7 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 5.8 |
| Chile | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.8 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 24.7 | 1.6 |
| Czech Republic | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 48.0 | 8.1 | 6.4 | 30.7 | 8.2 |
| Denmark | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 6.2 | 2.3 |
| Estonia | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.3 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 1.5 |
| Finland | 6.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 70.3 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Germany | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 5.0 | 9.9 | 36.5 | 6.2 |
| Greece | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 0.9 | 6.8 | 17.1 | 3.9 |
| Hungary | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.6 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 43.3 | 6.6 |
| Iceland | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 85.8 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
| Ireland | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 9.4 | 1.1 |
| Israel | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 32.9 | 6.9 |
| Italy | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46.5 | 2.5 | 14.3 | 25.4 | 9.3 |
| Japan | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.4 | 3.0 | 9.3 | 33.3 | 8.8 |
| Korea | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 1.7 | 13.8 | 24.9 | 4.9 |
| Luxembourg | c |  | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Mexico | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.8 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 9.0 | 6.5 |
| Netherlands | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.9 | 1.9 | 16.2 | 39.8 | 7.1 |
| New Zealand | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 81.4 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 20.7 | 0.2 |
| Norway | 5.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 78.0 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Poland | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.2 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 9.0 | 3.6 |
| Portugal | 6.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 0.5 | 8.3 | 20.5 | 2.0 |
| Slovak Republic | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 6.2 | 8.2 | 36.7 | 7.7 |
| Slovenia | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 40.1 | 6.1 |
| Spain | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.6 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 8.5 | 4.6 |
| Sweden | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.4 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 2.9 |
| Switzerland | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 59.9 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 17.8 | 5.2 |
| Turkey | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 1.0 | 15.7 | 37.2 | 6.6 |
| United Kingdom | 3.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 71.9 | 2.1 | 6.7 | 15.9 | 4.9 |
| United States | 5.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.1 | 0.5 | 5.9 | 13.2 | 2.9 |
| OECD average | 4.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 22.2 | 4.8 |
| $\cdots$ Albania | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 93.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 2.7 |
| Argentina | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.8 | 0.8 | 6.7 | 18.0 | 5.0 |
| © Brazil | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 17.0 | 6.5 |
| - Bulgaria | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.4 | 4.8 | 7.5 | 36.1 | 6.3 |
| Colombia | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.7 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 12.5 | 4.3 |
| Costa Rica | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 13.4 | 4.2 |
| Croatia | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49.0 | 1.5 | 11.1 | 24.4 | 3.8 |
| Cyprus* | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.8 | 0.8 | 10.3 | 20.9 | 0.8 |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.0 | 1.7 | 15.3 | 21.5 | 7.6 |
| Indonesia | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 2.1 | 8.0 | 11.5 | 9.8 |
| Jordan | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 2.3 | 7.0 | 10.6 | 5.6 |
| Kazakhstan | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.9 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 6.9 | 9.5 |
| Latvia | 3.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 54.4 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 9.9 | 4.2 |
| Lithuania | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.2 | 3.2 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 3.9 |
| Macao-China | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Malaysia | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.4 | 1.1 | 6.5 | 14.3 | 3.1 |
| Montenegro | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Peru | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.7 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 26.4 | 4.7 |
| Qatar | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.8 | 2.3 | 13.2 | 35.4 | 4.6 |
| Romania | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 20.3 | 5.7 |
| Russian Federation | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.5 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 9.4 | 7.9 |
| Serbia | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49.9 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 26.0 | 7.3 |
| Shanghai-China | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.2 | 0.8 | 13.4 | 36.7 | 5.2 |
| Singapore | 4.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 78.7 | 3.7 | 7.5 | 32.1 | 4.6 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 85.8 | 3.6 | 11.7 | 44.9 | 5.8 |
| Thailand | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 1.8 | 9.2 | 14.7 | 7.9 |
| Tunisia | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 34.2 | 3.6 | 12.1 | 13.5 | 6.2 |
| United Arab Emirates | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.3 | 5.5 | 10.8 | 18.4 | 7.2 |
| Uruguay | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.4 | 1.2 | 6.8 | 27.4 | 3.4 |
| Viet Nam | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 0.7 | 13.5 | 23.3 | 7.5 |

1. Multilevel regression model consists of the student and school levels.
2. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the variables of demographic and socio-economic background shown in Table IV.1.12c.
3. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the school-level variables shown in Table IV.1.12b
4. Multilevel regression model: Mathematics performance is regressed on the variables of demographic and socio-economic background and on the school-level variables shown in Table IV.1.12c.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 唡列 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384

Relationship between mathematics performance and the school＇s learning environment，resources，


| A Albania | 0.7 | （1．0） | c | c | 6.5 | （5．3） | 1.9 | （5．9） | 0.1 | （1．4） | 0.0 | （0．1） | c | c | －0．3 | （2．5） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | －0．8 | （0．1） | 8.0 | （6．5） | 4.5 | （5．7） | 2.0 | （7．3） | 1.1 | （1．2） | 0.2 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．2） | －1．4 | （2．9） |
| ส Brazil | －1．2 | （0．1） | －7．9 | （4．9） | 0.8 | （4．2） | 6.9 | （4．9） | －0．5 | （0．9） | 0.0 | （0．0） | －0．2 | （0．1） | －0．9 | （2．0） |
| Bulgaria | －0．7 | （0．5） | －28．6 | （11．7） | 11.3 | （7．7） | 4.2 | （5．4） | c | C | 0.1 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 8.6 | （6．8） |
| Colombia | －0．9 | （0．2） | －2．0 | （9．5） | －9．4 | （4．4） | 3.3 | （6．0） | 1.4 | （1．1） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．3 | （0．3） | 3.1 | （1．7） |
| Costa Rica | －1．4 | （0．2） | －3．5 | （4．3） | －8．2 | （4．6） | 3.9 | （4．9） | －0．4 | （1．2） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.2 | （0．1） | 2.5 | （2．5） |
| Croatia | －0．6 | （0．9） | 3.3 | （9．0） | 14.6 | （8．0） | 2.4 | （6．8） | 0.9 | （3．3） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．2 | （1．0） | 0.7 | （3．5） |
| Cyprus＊ | －2．1 | （0．4） | －10．8 | （4．6） | －20．3 | （6．6） | －7．6 | （6．8） | －3．7 | （1．5） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 11.6 | （2．7） | 0.0 | （2．0） |
| Hong Kong－China | －1．8 | （0．5） | －10．9 | （8．0） | 18.7 | （11．3） | －18．8 | （9．1） | －7．4 | （3．0） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 3.9 | （1．5） | 3.8 | （4．7） |
| Indonesia | －0．5 | （0．2） | －5．5 | （7．4） | －8．0 | （6．5） | －2．5 | （6．2） | －2．6 | （1．9） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．5 | （0．4） | －4．1 | （3．8） |
| Jordan | －2．3 | （0．5） | －5．0 | （6．6） | 7.0 | （5．1） | 5.0 | （5．1） | 0.7 | （1．1） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．5） | 2.3 | （2．0） |
| Kazakhstan | －0．4 | （1．0） | －4．8 | （17．6） | 3.5 | （5．8） | －16．3 | （7．0） | 0.0 | （0．9） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.4 | （0．8） | 2.5 | （2．9） |
| Latvia | －1．1 | （0．4） | －4．0 | （5．7） | 18.4 | （5．9） | －0．4 | （7．3） | 0.4 | （0．8） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 0.8 | （1．0） | －3．3 | （3．5） |
| Lithuania | －2．2 | （0．5） | 1.0 | （7．0） | 8.6 | （6．3） | －27．4 | （12．7） | 1.0 | （1．2） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．4） | 5.1 | （4．1） |
| Macao－China | c | c | C | C | C | c | c | C | C | C | C | c | C | c | C | C |
| Malaysia | c | c | －1．2 | （8．5） | 4.5 | （4．2） | －4．4 | （4．8） | 0.9 | （0．9） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．3 | （0．7） | 4.6 | （3．3） |
| Montenegro | c | c | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | c | C | c | c | C | C |
| Peru | －1．2 | （0．2） | －16．2 | （8．4） | 4.5 | （6．2） | 4.1 | （5．6） | －2．1 | （1．4） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．1 | （0．4） | 0.2 | （3．1） |
| Qatar | －1．4 | （0．3） | 15.7 | （10．4） | 9.6 | （7．5） | －20．1 | （9．2） | 10.1 | （3．5） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．9 | （0．2） | －3．0 | （4．2） |
| Romania | －0．6 | （0．4） | －17．9 | （9．4） | 3.2 | （5．2） | －9．1 | （6．6） | －4．9 | （3．3） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 0.6 | （0．4） | －11．9 | （4．4） |
| Russian Federation | －0．9 | （0．8） | －3．7 | （10．9） | 11.5 | （5．9） | 2.2 | （11．2） | 4.5 | （2．0） | －0．1 | （0．1） | －0．7 | （0．8） | 1.3 | （2．8） |
| Serbia | －4．4 | （1．9） | －14．4 | （15．8） | －5．4 | （10．2） | －5．4 | （7．7） | 2.7 | （1．5） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．8） | －9．8 | （5．6） |
| Shanghai－China | －1．4 | （0．4） | －6．8 | （10．8） | 14.8 | （6．0） | －8．2 | （9．7） | －2．4 | （3．3） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 0.6 | （0．7） | －5．9 | （2．4） |
| Singapore | －1．0 | （0．9） | －16．9 | （16．6） | 2.1 | （5．6） | 13.7 | （25．1） | 16.3 | （7．1） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．6） | 2.6 | （3．7） |
| Chinese Taipei | －9．0 | （2．3） | 1.5 | （7．3） | 17.8 | （7．2） | －7．6 | （6．7） | －0．5 | （1．4） | －0．4 | （0．1） | 0.9 | （0．8） | －4．8 | （3．7） |
| Thailand | 0.1 | （0．8） | －8．4 | （6．6） | －1．4 | （8．3） | －5．5 | （6．5） | 29.5 | （13．2） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．5 | （0．4） | 7.0 | （3．2） |
| Tunisia | －1．3 | （0．2） | －6．2 | （8．6） | －0．6 | （6．4） | 3.7 | （7．6） | 2.0 | （1．6） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．2） | －2．9 | （3．2） |
| United Arab Emirates | －0．9 | （0．2） | 18.6 | （7．5） | 0.0 | （4．6） | －1．7 | （5．4） | 3.7 | （1．6） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.6 | （0．5） | 2.3 | （2．0） |
| Uruguay | －1．2 | （0．2） | －4．8 | （7．7） | －1．0 | （5．6） | －23．9 | （9．5） | 3.3 | （2．1） | －0．1 | （0．1） | －0．5 | （0．3） | 2.9 | （2．7） |
| Viet Nam | －1．0 | （0．4） | 12.7 | （12．9） | 10.9 | （8．1） | 8.9 | （7．1） | 1.4 | （1．0） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －1．8 | （0．6） | 1.1 | （2．6） |

Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
1．Multilevel regression model（student and school levels）：Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 唡列覀 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
[Part 2/4]
Relationship between mathematics performance and the school's learning environment, resources, Table IV.1.12b policies and practices


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex


Relationship between mathematics performance and the school＇s learning environment，resources， Table IV．1．12b policies and practices

|  |  | School governance ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 岗 |  | س゙ |  | 山゙ |  | نِّ |  | نِّ |  | نِّ |  | نِّ |  | س |  | س゙ |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 1.3 （1．8） | －3．4 | （1．8） | －13．8 | （9．1） | －12．3 | （5．6） | －2．0 | （3．2） | 3.1 | （2．6） | －3．9 | （2．1） | －3．1 | （2．5） | 3.4 | （3．5） | 3.1 | （5．2） |
| W | Austria | 6.7 （5．6） | －7．1 | （3．6） | －4．6 | （6．5） | －19．4 | （22．2） | －0．7 | （5．3） | 1.6 | （5．0） | －1．1 | （3．6） | －2．5 | （5．2） | －14．0 | （8．4） | －0．1 | （7．1） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 15.6 （10．4） | 4.1 | （2．3） | 1.2 | （6．9） | w | w | 5.3 | （3．1） | －3．6 | （2．6） | －3．2 | （2．6） | 1.0 | （2．5） | －1．1 | （4．0） | －1．8 | （4．9） |
|  | Canada | 7.3 （3．0） | 1.1 | （2．7） | 2.3 | （3．7） | －4．7 | （8．7） | －5．4 | （2．3） | －2．8 | （2．4） | 0.8 | （2．0） | 2.9 | （2．0） | 7.0 | （3．2） | －9．6 | （4．2） |
|  | Chile | 8.6 （1．6） | －1．8 | （2．1） | 2.1 | （6．6） | －37．5 | （7．2） | 4.4 | （3．4） | 1.5 | （3．0） | －6．0 | （2．9） | －1．2 | （3．0） | －1．7 | （12．2） | －10．0 | （6．4） |
|  | Czech Republic | －3．7（2．7） | 5.0 | （3．8） | 31.8 | （9．2） | －9．4 | （15．2） | 5.9 | （4．0） | 8.7 | （3．2） | －6．7 | （3．6） | －12．7 | （6．4） | 6.0 | （8．8） | －39．8 | （18．1） |
|  | Denmark | －0．5（2．4） | 1.5 | （2．2） | 7.6 | （5．9） | －12．0 | （12．1） | －1．8 | （2．9） | －4．3 | （3．2） | 2.4 | （2．4） | 4.4 | （2．5） | －10．3 | （5．2） | 1.0 | （4．0） |
|  | Estonia | －1．1（3．3） | －2．0 | （2．2） | 11.9 | （4．3） | －70．0 | （21．0） | 7.0 | （4．1） | 1.6 | （2．8） | －4．0 | （3．5） | －5．2 | （2．8） | －17．8 | （7．6） | －6．0 | （8．0） |
|  | Finland | 4.1 （3．0） | 4.9 | （1．8） | 0.0 | （3．7） | c | c | －2．3 | （2．6） | －3．6 | （2．1） | －1．7 | （2．7） | 1.9 | （2．4） | －6．8 | （5．6） | －0．7 | （3．6） |
|  | France | －23．5（8．4） | 3.1 | （2．4） | 6.1 | （4．9） | C | C | －2．4 | （2．8） | 5.4 | （3．2） | －4．3 | （3．6） | －2．4 | （3．5） | 21.3 | （9．0） | 4.0 | （4．6） |
|  | Germany | －44．5（19．7） | －4．8 | （3．3） | 8.9 | （8．3） | －87．5 | （19．8） | 4.2 | （5．8） | －4．0 | （4．3） | －12．8 | （4．4） | 14.4 | （3．8） | 9.6 | （7．6） | －11．4 | （6．1） |
|  | Greece | －20．8（21．8） | －18．7 | （9．3） | 8.3 | （5．7） | －55．1 | （21．9） | 6.7 | （4．0） | －5．5 | （3．0） | －1．0 | （3．3） | －2．4 | （2．9） | 5.5 | （17．0） | 6.5 | （6．9） |
|  | Hungary | －1．4（2．7） | －4．3 | （3．6） | 14.0 | （7．6） | C | c | 13.9 | （5．6） | －14．5 | （4．9） | －7．5 | （4．9） | －1．6 | （6．4） | －1．4 | （9．2） | －31．9 | （9．1） |
|  | Iceland | 5.1 （4．2） | 1.2 | （3．3） | 4.4 | （6．2） | C | c | 4.8 | （6．4） | －5．1 | （6．0） | －0．1 | （4．2） | －0．5 | （6．0） | 24.8 | （7．6） | 7.7 | （7．6） |
|  | Ireland | 4.2 （9．6） | 1.2 | （2．7） | －4．4 | （6．0） | －53．4 | （13．8） | －3．0 | （2．8） | 2.8 | （2．9） | －1．6 | （3．1） | 2.5 | （3．0） | 0.3 | （4．8） | 14.5 | （9．2） |
|  | Israel | －9．6（7．1） | 7.9 | （3．7） | 6.4 | （7．0） | C | C | 0.6 | （5．7） | －2．4 | （4．0） | －1．0 | （5．1） | －0．7 | （5．2） | －23．3 | （7．4） | 17.5 | （11．6） |
|  | Italy | 6.0 （2．6） | －0．7 | （1．6） | 2.2 | （3．2） | －2．3 | （11．1） | 1.3 | （3．0） | －0．2 | （2．2） | 0.2 | （2．1） | －5．8 | （2．2） | －1．3 | （3．2） | －4．2 | （3．0） |
|  | Japan | 11.7 （6．3） | 3.7 | （4．2） | －13．7 | （9．8） | 33.8 | （11．0） | 4.6 | （4．5） | 0.6 | （3．3） | 0.2 | （3．8） | －1．1 | （5．2） | 0.9 | （7．4） | 12.4 | （8．8） |
|  | Korea | －2．3（4．9） | 1.5 | （2．7） | 2.7 | （10．2） | －20．4 | （7．5） | －2．3 | （5．9） | －2．1 | （3．6） | 2.8 | （5．8） | －2．1 | （4．8） | －9．4 | （7．5） | －1．2 | （7．3） |
|  | Luxembourg | c C | c | c | c | C | c | c | C | C | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c | C |
|  | Mexico | 4.7 （2．3） | 3.5 | （2．2） | 1.1 | （3．9） | －5．1 | （7．5） | －2．6 | （2．0） | －2．1 | （1．4） | 1.8 | （1．5） | 2.0 | （1．9） | －2．3 | （2．7） | －3．8 | （8．1） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．5（2．4） | －3．1 | （4．1） | 11.3 | （7．4） | c | c | 16.3 | （4．9） | 0.3 | （4．8） | －4．8 | （3．5） | －8．2 | （4．0） | －1．4 | （5．6） | 6.7 | （12．6） |
|  | New Zealand | －2．4（3．9） | －0．2 | （2．5） | －7．1 | （7．9） | －22．7 | （11．3） | －6．3 | （5．2） | －5．2 | （3．6） | 9.1 | （3．8） | 2.5 | （4．3） | 4.3 | （6．3） | －3．7 | （6．9） |
|  | Norway | 2.5 （4．7） | －0．6 | （3．8） | 1.3 | （4．9） | c | c | 2.0 | （5．1） | －0．3 | （3．8） | 0.5 | （4．3） | －0．3 | （3．7） | 4.1 | （6．5） | －4．2 | （7．1） |
|  | Poland | －3．6（5．9） | －0．3 | （3．1） | 3.3 | （5．2） | －34．8 | （19．5） | 1.7 | （3．4） | 1.1 | （4．5） | 0.3 | （3．5） | 0.8 | （4．7） | －1．1 | （10．5） | 31.2 | （8．4） |
|  | Portugal | 4.0 （4．9） | －12．8 | （4．5） | 2.6 | （4．9） | －22．7 | （12．3） | －5．0 | （3．0） | 5.7 | （3．0） | 0.1 | （3．1） | －1．9 | （3．2） | 15.9 | （9．6） | －7．5 | （9．0） |
|  | Slovak Republic | －0．5（2．8） | 1.8 | （3．7） | －0．7 | （8．8） | －71．5 | （24．2） | 11.0 | （5．7） | －4．1 | （4．7） | －13．2 | （5．2） | 1.5 | （5．6） | －24．7 | （8．1） | 7.2 | （13．5） |
|  | Slovenia | －0．8（5．6） | 0.1 | （4．4） | 9.6 | （6．0） | C | c | －15．2 | （4．9） | 6.0 | （4．8） | 6.8 | （4．4） | －0．9 | （4．9） | 0.0 | （6．3） | －16．8 | （14．1） |
|  | Spain | 8.4 （2．7） | －2．6 | （2．2） | 5.5 | （4．1） | －5．5 | （5．2） | －3．3 | （1．9） | －0．9 | （2．1） | －1．9 | （1．7） | 2.4 | （2．4） | －0．3 | （3．0） | 5.8 | （6．8） |
|  | Sweden | 1.6 （2．1） | －3．0 | （2．8） | 0.3 | （5．5） | c | c | －3．3 | （3．9） | 1.3 | （4．2） | －5．0 | （3．0） | －0．8 | （4．0） | －2．5 | （5．4） | －2．7 | （4．5） |
|  | Switzerland | －6．5（4．5） | －2．5 | （5．0） | －5．5 | （4．9） | 16.1 | （13．1） | 4.8 | （3．1） | －0．3 | （2．8） | －3．2 | （3．2） | －3．8 | （2．8） | －14．8 | （5．4） | －9．8 | （5．7） |
|  | Turkey | －52．2（34．1） | －12．8 | （8．8） | 8.0 | （6．4） | c | C | 5.2 | （3．9） | －2．1 | （3．7） | －8．1 | （3．3） | －1．6 | （4．6） | －5．2 | （35．8） | 10.2 | （9．1） |
|  | United Kingdom | 1.1 （1．9） | 0.4 | （2．5） | －14．2 | （8．1） | －21．0 | （11．4） | －0．1 | （4．0） | 1.3 | （3．3） | －6．6 | （2．6） | －3．2 | （2．9） | －2．1 | （4．9） | 15.0 | （8．1） |
|  | United States | －4．5（2．5） | －3．4 | （2．9） | －9．8 | （5．4） | 25.3 | （8．9） | 2.2 | （3．8） | 1.6 | （3．7） | 1.6 | （3．8） | －10．5 | （3．9） | 0.7 | （4．6） | 2.7 | （11．3） |
|  | OECD average | －2．6（1．6） | －1．3 | （0．7） | 2.4 | （1．1） | －23．0 | （3．0） | 1.4 | （0．7） | －0．6 | （0．6） | －2．2 | （0．6） | －1．1 | （0．7） | －1．1 | （1．7） | －0．6 | （1．5） |



Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
1．Multilevel regression model（student and school levels）：Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
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| $\cdots$ | Albania | -0.6 (2.6) | -0.4 (6.4) | -15.6 (6.0) | -5.6 (6.1) | -5.5 (9.2) | -9.6 (11.3) | -13.8 (11.8) | 0.5 | (2.9) | -2.2 | (3.1) | 0.4 | (3.3) | 0.9 | (2.2) | -0.1 | (2.9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T | Argentina | 0.5 (1.8) | 2.9 (6.7) | -7.7 (4.5) | 0.4 (4.2) | -1.4 (3.9) | -51.0 (8.9) | 21.7 (9.5) | 1.7 | (3.0) | 3.1 | (2.3) | 4.2 | (3.4) | 6.0 | (1.3) | 4.3 | (1.6) |
| む | Brazil | -0.6 (1.8) | -4.6 (3.7) | -5.3 (5.3) | -1.9 (3.2) | 2.3 (5.7) | -14.9 (6.8) | 27.5 (6.6) | -2.5 | (2.2) | 3.7 | (1.9) | 0.6 | (1.8) | 2.0 | (1.1) | 0.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Bulgaria | 2.9 (4.7) | 19.3 (6.0) | -3.1 (9.7) | 7.5 (7.4) | -2.5 (6.1) | -56.4 (10.9) | 23.0 (12.6) | -3.6 | (3.0) | 5.6 | (3.7) | 9.2 | (4.0) | 2.9 | (2.1) | 7.7 | (2.5) |
|  | Colombia | 3.2 (2.7) | 4.2 (4.1) | -3.3 (5.3) | 12.4 (4.7) | -5.7 (4.8) | -44.2 (9.5) | 13.2 (9.3) | -1.9 | (2.2) | 7.2 | (2.8) | 1.3 | (2.6) | 1.3 | (1.3) | 2.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Costa Rica | -0.9 (2.0) | 4.5 (6.0) | 5.5 (11.1) | -5.6 (3.9) | 2.1 (4.8) | -8.5 (11.2) | 12.7 (10.0) | -2.5 | (3.9) | 3.2 | (2.9) | 6.1 | (2.4) | -0.1 | (1.2) | 2.8 | (2.1) |
|  | Croatia | -5.1 (2.3) | 1.0 (4.5) | 0.3 (6.9) | -7.5 (4.3) | -8.3 (20.9) | -4.6 (11.8) | 24.8 (9.5) | -2.0 | (3.5) | 1.2 | (3.3) | 2.0 | (2.9) | 6.9 | (2.1) | 12.1 | (2.9) |
|  | Cyprus* | 7.8 (1.6) | 1.3 (9.5) | 15.1 (6.8) | 0.0 (5.1) | 4.9 (9.9) | 17.4 (14.6) | 69.9 (14.6) | 7.4 | (5.6) | -8.7 | (4.6) | -2.6 | (3.0) | -4.0 | 2.6) | 12.1 | (2.4) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -1.6 (4.4) | -3.8 (7.6) | -3.5 (6.2) | 2.6 (7.7) | -9.4 (9.6) | -7.0 (22.8) | 0.6 (14.5) | 6.1 | (5.3) | -3.2 | (4.6) | 10.1 | (4.8) | -0.3 | 4.3) | 12.7 | (9.1) |
|  | Indonesia | -9.6 (5.2) | 0.3 (8.0) | -3.4 (6.6) | 11.3 (10.7) | c | 5.6 (14.8) | -8.9 (14.0) | -1.0 | (3.6) | -1.5 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (3.2) | 6.2 | (1.9) | 5.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Jordan | -0.7 (2.9) | -8.3 (6.2) | -1.0 (6.2) | 5.3 (5.6) | -4.2 (4.6) | -4.6 (10.1) | 46.1 (9.0) | -0.5 | (2.9) | -0.8 | (2.5) | 8.0 | (2.8) | -2.2 | (1.7) | 3.0 | (2.1) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -7.7 (10.0) | 1.8 (7.9) | C C | -5.9 (9.6) | -0.6 (21.2) | -12.0 (14.6) | 43.8 (12.9) | -3.4 | (2.8) | 4.0 | (3.0) | -3.3 | (2.8) | -1.4 | (2.8) | 3.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Latvia | 8.8 (8.3) | 2.8 (5.4) | $\begin{array}{ll}-2.3 & (6.2)\end{array}$ | 6.1 (6.1) | 3.6 (5.1) | -29.9 (8.6) | 2.9 (8.2) | -0.7 | (3.1) | 4.3 | (3.3) | 2.0 | (3.5) | 2.6 | (1.5) | 8.7 | (2.1) |
|  | Lithuania | 5.6 (2.4) | -2.7 (5.0) | -0.9 (6.3) | -12.5 (5.9) | -0.8 (4.4) | 10.4 (9.2) | 28.4 (7.3) | 6.4 | (4.2) | -3.9 | (4.4) | 0.7 | (3.2) | 4.0 | (1.5) | 6.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Macao-China | C | C C | C C | C C |  | c c |  | C | C | c | c | c | C | c |  | C | c |
|  | Malaysia | -5.3 (3.5) | -8.6 (5.8) | 19.3 (15.0) | 11.1 (4.1) | 0.8 (5.9) | -8.0 (11.5) | 52.9 (13.8) | 7.0 | (2.5) | 0.5 | (2.8) | -0.9 | 2.4) | 6.5 | (1.9) | 0.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Montenegro | c | C C | C c | c c | c c | $\mathrm{c} \quad \mathrm{c}$ | C c | C | c | C | c | c | C | c | c | C | c |
|  | Peru | 3.5 (2.3) | -1.4 (8.7) | -3.4 (5.1) | -10.3 (5.9) | 7.7 (12.6) | -8.7 (10.5) | 13.8 (12.7) | -1.6 | (2.9) | -0.1 | (3.3) | 1.4 | (3.2) | 4.2 | (1.4) | 8.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Qatar | -8.0 (3.9) | 3.6 (6.3) | -63.9 (14.2) | -29.0 (14.1) | c c | 4.9 (16.2) | 64.9 (18.6) | 1.0 | (3.1) | -1.4 | (2.9) | 1.1 | (3.7) | 10.4 | (3.3) | -3.7 | (3.4) |
|  | Romania | 2.0 (2.4) | 2.2 (5.7) | -8.0 (6.3) | -9.4 (7.0) | -2.5 (7.7) | -35.1 (13.0) | $54.5 \quad(9.2)$ | 0.8 | (3.2) | -1.0 | (3.2) | 1.5 | (2.9) | -1.7 | (2.3) | 3.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Russian Federatio | 5.0 (3.5) | 2.0 (5.6) | 37.2 (15.5) | 6.4 (5.8) | 0.5 (10.0) | -25.7 (12.8) | 25.3 (9.3) | -1.0 | (3.1) | 6.5 | (2.9) | 5.4 | (3.0) | 1.8 | (1.9) | 5.6 | (2.5) |
|  | Serbia | 1.0 (3.4) | 1.0 (6.9) | -15.3 (7.1) | $14.0 \quad$ (6.2) | 8.6 (16.3) | -38.2 (15.1) | 41.2 (12.3) | 2.6 | (4.1) | 0.3 | (5.8) | -7.3 | (3.7) | 6.9 | (2.1) | 6.3 | (4.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 3.9 (3.1) | -4.0 (12.4) | -13.5 (6.4) | -11.7 (9.0) | 14.9 (14.9) | 23.2 (14.7) | 39.0 (13.6) | -0.3 | (2.9) | 2.2 | (2.3) | -2.1 | (2.7) | 2.7 | (2.8) | -8.5 | (20.4) |
|  | Singapore | -39.0 (15.3) | 16.0 (6.0) | 18.5 (25.0) | 26.4 (11.7) | -4.2 (25.0) | 30.9 (19.5) | 37.6 (12.6) | 0.3 | (4.4) | 10.2 | (5.3) | 5.3 | (2.8) | 5.9 | (3.7) | -1.7 | (3.3) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | -8.8 (2.4) | 15.2 (8.8) | 6.6 (6.8) | -10.3 (6.6) | 5.9 (7.3) | 11.2 (21.1) | 9.3 (16.8) | 3.3 | (3.0) | 1.2 | (3.1) | 1.9 | (3.9) | -0.3 | (3.0) | 22.0 | (6.8) |
|  | Thailand | 1.7 (4.3) | 7.2 (6.4) | 46.5 (14.1) | 8.9 (6.2) | -21.3 (13.5) | -30.9 (18.1) | 9.5 (18.1) | 6.5 | (4.2) | 6.2 | (4.1) | -1.6 | (3.0) | 1.9 | (1.8) | 7.9 | (2.6) |
|  | Tunisia | -2.7 (2.5) | 1.4 (8.8) | -1.5 (6.8) | 1.3 (6.7) | -10.6 (8.1) | -54.5 (18.2) | 38.2 (16.2) | 4.2 | (4.9) | -6.3 | (4.6) | 0.7 | (2.8) | 3.2 | (2.7) | 8.7 | (2.3) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 1.0 (4.1) | -1.9 (5.0) | -6.9 (7.0) | -6.2 (5.5) | 11.0 (7.9) | -11.0 (10.0) | 27.8 (7.9) | 2.8 | (2.7) | 0.1 | (2.9) | 1.8 | (2.7) | 7.6 | (1.6) | 4.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 3.3 (1.9) | 4.2 (7.0) | -0.7 (5.0) | -1.4 (4.3) | 4.3 (4.9) | -30.4 (12.7) | 25.2 (9.7) | 1.0 | (3.3) | -0.4 | (2.3) | 1.0 | (2.9) | 0.7 | (1.9) | 2.0 | (2.3) |
|  | Viet Nam | 0.9 (5.1) | 0.8 (7.1) | -9.7 (7.6) | 14.3 (6.4) | -16.1 (20.4) | -45.6 (15.2) | 34.4 (19.0) | -4.9 | (4.5) | 9.7 | (5.6) | 2.0 | (4.5) | 1.4 | (3.5) | 14.2 | (4.9) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Relationship among mathematics performance，the school＇s learning environment，resources，policies Table IV．1．12c and practices，and student and school characteristics


| A Albania | 0.7 | （0．9） | c | c | 8.2 | （5．3） | 0.0 | （5．8） | －0．1 | （1．4） | 0.0 | （0．1） | c | c | －0．6 | （2．5） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { S }}{ }$ Argentina | －0．8 | （0．2） | 4.2 | （5．8） | －0．5 | （5．3） | 2.8 | （7．0） | 0.7 | （1．2） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．2） | －1．5 | （2．8） |
| ๕ Brazil | －0．9 | （0．1） | －6．3 | （4．0） | 1.2 | （3．6） | 4.9 | （3．8） | －0．2 | （0．8） | 0.0 | （0．0） | －0．2 | （0．1） | －0．2 | （1．7） |
| Bulgaria | －0．7 | （0．5） | －30．4 | （11．4） | 8.3 | （6．2） | －0．7 | （4．5） | c | C | 0.2 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 8.1 | （4．9） |
| Colombia | －0．7 | （0．2） | －1．3 | （8．1） | －6．6 | （3．8） | 4.4 | （5．5） | 0.4 | （0．8） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．4 | （0．2） | 2.4 | （1．5） |
| Costa Rica | －1．0 | （0．2） | －1．2 | （3．9） | －7．1 | （4．0） | 3.4 | （4．3） | －0．8 | （1．1） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.4 | （0．1） | 1.4 | （2．4） |
| Croatia | －0．9 | （0．7） | 1.1 | （9．2） | 27.2 | （9．3） | 2.9 | （6．2） | 1.6 | （2．9） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －1．0 | （1．0） | 0.2 | （3．2） |
| Cyprus＊ | －1．9 | （0．4） | －10．7 | （4．8） | －5．3 | （7．1） | 0.1 | （5．2） | －2．3 | （1．4） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 14.7 | （2．3） | －0．5 | （2．1） |
| Hong Kong－China | －1．7 | （0．5） | －10．2 | （7．1） | 9.5 | （10．3） | －11．8 | （7．9） | －2．6 | （3．1） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 6.5 | （1．6） | 2.4 | （4．2） |
| Indonesia | －0．2 | （0．2） | －5．9 | （7．0） | －6．4 | （6．0） | －8．5 | （5．7） | －1．7 | （1．6） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －1．3 | （0．5） | －0．6 | （3．5） |
| Jordan | －1．5 | （0．4） | －4．0 | （5．7） | 1.2 | （4．9） | 3.6 | （4．3） | 1.1 | （1．0） | 0.0 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．6） | 1.0 | （1．8） |
| Kazakhstan | －0．4 | （0．9） | 5.7 | （14．1） | 4.2 | （5．8） | －17．4 | （5．9） | －0．9 | （0．9） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 2.0 | （0．9） | 3.1 | （2．6） |
| Latvia | －0．3 | （0．4） | 2.7 | （5．6） | 9.1 | （4．8） | 2.6 | （6．0） | －0．4 | （0．6） | 0.0 | （0．0） | 0.7 | （1．4） | －3．1 | （2．8） |
| Lithuania | －1．2 | （0．5） | 6.5 | （5．7） | 6.9 | （5．2） | －21．3 | （12．1） | 0.3 | （1．0） | 0.1 | （0．0） | －0．1 | （0．2） | 6.6 | （3．6） |
| Macao－China | c | c | C | C | C | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C |
| Malaysia | c | C | －3．1 | （8．5） | 1.9 | （4．0） | －2．5 | （4．5） | 0.5 | （0．9） | 0.1 | （0．0） | －0．7 | （0．8） | 3.5 | （3．0） |
| Montenegro | c | c | C | C | c | c | C | C | c | C | C | c | c | C | C | c |
| Peru | －0．4 | （0．2） | －7．4 | （6．0） | 6.1 | （5．0） | 3.9 | （4．9） | －2．1 | （1．1） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 0.0 | （0．3） | 1.0 | （2．5） |
| Qatar | －0．8 | （0．3） | 11.8 | （11．2） | 3.9 | （5．9） | －14．5 | （9．0） | 10.6 | （4．0） | 0.2 | （0．1） | －0．7 | （0．2） | －4．6 | （4．3） |
| Romania | －0．1 | （0．4） | －16．4 | （8．8） | 1.2 | （4．6） | －3．9 | （6．1） | －7．5 | （3．3） | －0．1 | （0．0） | 1.0 | （0．4） | －7．4 | （4．1） |
| Russian Federation | －0．7 | （0．9） | 2.0 | （10．4） | 9.4 | （5．8） | －5．3 | （9．2） | 3.4 | （2．1） | －0．1 | （0．1） | －1．6 | （1．0） | 1.4 | （2．8） |
| Serbia | －2．9 | （1．5） | －12．6 | （13．7） | －10．5 | （9．5） | －3．7 | （7．5） | 1.2 | （1．3） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．7 | （1．0） | －6．1 | （5．4） |
| Shanghai－China | －1．2 | （0．4） | －0．4 | （11．1） | 11.6 | （6．1） | －9．4 | （9．2） | －2．0 | （3．3） | －0．1 | （0．1） | 1.0 | （0．7） | －4．1 | （2．3） |
| Singapore | 0.0 | （0．8） | －9．9 | （13．7） | 0.8 | （5．3） | 19.9 | （14．5） | 13.0 | （5．7） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －1．3 | （0．6） | －0．5 | （3．0） |
| Chinese Taipei | －7．0 | （2．1） | 8.0 | （6．5） | 20.3 | （5．8） | －0．8 | （5．9） | －0．2 | （1．1） | －0．3 | （0．1） | －0．8 | （0．7） | －2．5 | （3．3） |
| Thailand | 0.3 | （0．8） | －9．1 | （6．2） | －4．0 | （7．2） | －7．1 | （5．7） | 22.7 | （11．6） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．8 | （0．4） | 7.3 | （3．2） |
| Tunisia | －1．1 | （0．2） | －7．9 | （6．4） | 0.5 | （5．7） | 1.2 | （5．8） | 2.8 | （1．6） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －0．1 | （0．1） | －3．8 | （2．9） |
| United Arab Emirates | －0．5 | （0．2） | 16.5 | （5．5） | 0.1 | （4．0） | －5．4 | （4．5） | 3.9 | （1．2） | 0.0 | （0．0） | －0．1 | （0．4） | 1.8 | （1．5） |
| Uruguay | －0．8 | （0．2） | 1.2 | （7．1） | －4．8 | （5．4） | －12．8 | （11．5） | 2.4 | （2．1） | 0.0 | （0．0） | －0．7 | （0．3） | 2.2 | （2．7） |
| Viet Nam | －1．0 | （0．4） | 7.2 | （11．7） | 6.1 | （8．4） | 5.0 | （6．7） | 1.7 | （1．0） | 0.0 | （0．1） | －1．7 | （0．8） | 1.4 | （2．8） |

Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
1．Multilevel regression model（student and school levels）：Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
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Relationship among mathematics performance, the school's learning environment, resources, policies Table IV.1.12c and practices, and student and school characteristics

|  | Resources invested in education at the school level ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. | Change in score | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 3.1 | (2.0) | -3.7 | (2.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.8) | 0.4 | (0.8) | 7.0 | (4.0) | 1.4 | (1.6) | -2.7 | (1.8) |
| Austria | 4.3 | (2.9) | -1.8 | (2.4) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (2.0) | 1.1 | (2.9) | 7.3 | (6.5) | 3.2 | (3.3) | 2.0 | (3.1) |
| - Belgium | -0.4 | (2.1) | -0.3 | (2.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (1.6) | 2.0 | (2.8) | 1.4 | (4.4) | -2.3 | (1.9) | 1.6 | (2.6) |
| Canada | -1.8 | (1.7) | 1.1 | (2.0) | -0.1 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 3.4 | (3.4) | -2.6 | (2.4) | 0.8 | (1.3) |
| Chile | -2.6 | (1.6) | -0.2 | (1.4) | -0.1 | (0.0) | 3.1 | (1.4) | -2.2 | (1.2) | -2.5 | (3.8) | -0.4 | (1.7) | 2.3 | (1.4) |
| Czech Republic | 0.3 | (3.5) | -5.0 | (4.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -1.8 | (1.6) | 3.5 | (2.1) | 6.9 | (7.8) | -0.2 | (2.7) | -1.0 | (2.8) |
| Denmark | 0.7 | (2.4) | 1.0 | (1.9) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -1.1 | (1.5) | 1.7 | (1.6) | 1.7 | (3.9) | -3.6 | (1.8) | -1.6 | (2.5) |
| Estonia | -1.6 | (2.5) | -2.0 | (1.7) | 0.2 | (0.2) | -1.7 | (1.0) | 0.8 | (2.1) | -6.2 | (5.3) | 4.1 | (2.1) | -1.4 | (1.8) |
| Finland | -1.6 | (1.6) | -0.7 | (1.5) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -1.3 | (2.1) | 1.0 | (1.3) | -1.4 | (4.3) | -0.9 | (1.6) | 0.8 | (1.7) |
| France | -1.5 | (2.6) | -2.7 | (2.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | -0.7 | (1.5) | 6.0 | (3.0) | -11.2 | (5.9) | -3.7 | (2.5) | 7.7 | (2.4) |
| Germany | 1.6 | (3.3) | -0.6 | (2.8) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (2.2) | 12.0 | (2.7) | 7.9 | (6.4) | 2.9 | (3.3) | 3.0 | (2.3) |
| Greece | -4.4 | (2.9) | 2.7 | (2.9) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 4.4 | (1.5) | 3.0 | (1.6) | -2.1 | (9.1) | 0.1 | (1.8) | 4.2 | (3.4) |
| Hungary | 5.0 | (3.1) | -0.6 | (3.4) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 2.7 | (1.7) | 0.3 | (4.9) | -0.8 | (8.1) | 1.1 | (2.7) | -0.5 | (2.1) |
| Iceland | -0.4 | (3.8) | -5.5 | (4.1) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -4.1 | (2.2) | 1.9 | (5.5) | 7.5 | (5.7) | 5.4 | (3.4) | -2.6 | (1.9) |
| Ireland | 1.5 | (1.9) | -2.0 | (1.4) | 0.0 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (1.0) | -1.3 | (1.5) | 1.1 | (4.6) | 2.5 | (2.0) | -0.2 | (1.7) |
| Israel | -1.1 | (3.4) | 0.4 | (3.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -1.9 | (1.9) | 9.2 | (2.0) | -9.2 | (9.5) | 5.8 | (2.7) | -0.8 | (2.8) |
| Italy | -0.8 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (1.4) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.7) | 8.3 | (1.5) | -2.4 | (5.0) | 2.6 | (1.5) | 1.7 | (1.7) |
| Japan | -1.6 | (3.0) | -1.6 | (3.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (1.9) | 13.4 | (6.6) | -17.7 | (8.0) | 3.0 | (3.6) | 8.0 | (3.1) |
| Korea | 3.8 | (4.3) | -2.9 | (3.9) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 5.6 | (1.4) | 3.3 | (2.0) | -3.0 | (9.2) | 2.9 | (3.5) | 0.1 | (3.4) |
| Luxembourg | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | , | c | c | c | c | c |
| Mexico | 0.0 | (1.3) | 1.2 | (1.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.7) | 1.3 | (0.7) | 2.7 | (3.0) | -0.7 | (1.1) | 0.3 | (0.9) |
| Netherlands | -1.1 | (3.6) | 0.0 | (3.9) | 0.0 | (0.2) | 7.7 | (1.5) | -1.0 | (4.9) | 0.3 | (6.1) | -5.6 | (3.2) | 2.2 | (3.6) |
| New Zealand | 1.6 | (2.6) | -2.9 | (2.6) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (1.5) | 3.6 | (1.7) | 10.9 | (7.7) | 5.1 | (4.0) | 2.1 | (2.2) |
| Norway | -5.4 | (3.4) | 0.2 | (2.7) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (1.8) | 0.3 | (2.1) | -2.7 | (5.0) | -2.0 | (2.5) | 2.3 | (2.7) |
| Poland | -2.6 | (2.6) | -3.0 | (2.8) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (1.4) | 2.1 | (1.4) | 6.0 | (8.0) | 1.8 | (3.8) | -5.2 | (3.1) |
| Portugal | 4.0 | (2.3) | -3.3 | (2.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 2.9 | (1.9) | 3.2 | (1.3) | 1.7 | (6.0) | -5.4 | (2.1) | 3.8 | (2.3) |
| Slovak Republic | -4.3 | (4.5) | 3.3 | (3.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (1.4) | 0.3 | (2.3) | -9.7 | (7.9) | 0.3 | (2.4) | 3.5 | (3.1) |
| Slovenia | -0.2 | (3.1) | -4.6 | (2.7) | 0.4 | (0.2) | -3.5 | (1.3) | 1.5 | (1.4) | -0.6 | (5.4) | 4.1 | (2.5) | 2.1 | (2.2) |
| Spain | 1.0 | (1.6) | -0.5 | (1.6) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.9) | 1.4 | (1.2) | 0.0 | (3.1) | -1.3 | (1.4) | 1.4 | (1.5) |
| Sweden | -5.1 | (3.0) | 2.5 | (2.2) | -0.1 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (1.6) | -0.3 | (1.6) | -3.8 | (5.4) | 2.0 | (2.1) | 4.4 | (2.4) |
| Switzerland | -2.3 | (2.4) | 3.0 | (2.9) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -1.6 | (1.5) | -1.2 | (0.8) | -11.9 | (4.6) | -1.1 | (2.0) | 8.4 | (2.4) |
| Turkey | 1.8 | (4.0) | -13.4 | (3.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (1.6) | 6.1 | (4.5) | -8.3 | (7.1) | -1.4 | (2.7) | 7.0 | (2.8) |
| United Kingdom | 1.2 | (2.3) | -2.0 | (2.3) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 4.3 | (1.2) | 5.4 | (1.4) | -17.7 | (7.0) | 0.3 | (3.1) | -3.1 | (1.9) |
| United States | -2.9 | (3.1) | 3.7 | (4.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (1.4) | 1.1 | (2.4) | 0.1 | (5.0) | 6.6 | (4.7) | 2.9 | (2.0) |
| OECD average | -0.4 | (0.5) | -1.1 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.5) | -1.4 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 1.6 | (0.4) |
| n Albania | 3.6 | (3.2) | -0.5 | (2.9) | 0.2 | (0.2) | -1.1 | (1.5) | 2.1 | (1.7) | 5.3 | (6.4) | 5.3 | (3.1) | -3.0 | (2.0) |
| Argentina | 0.1 | (2.4) | -1.9 | (2.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (1.3) | 1.3 | (1.5) | -3.6 | (5.9) | 1.8 | (1.9) | -0.1 | (1.9) |
| 2 Brazil | 3.0 | (1.6) | -1.2 | (1.6) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -0.8 | (1.2) | 1.8 | (1.0) | -3.0 | (4.6) | 0.9 | (2.1) | 2.5 | (2.3) |
| - Bulgaria | -2.3 | (3.8) | -1.2 | (2.8) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (1.5) | -2.3 | (2.2) | -6.0 | (7.3) | -3.1 | (2.6) | 1.6 | (2.6) |
| Colombia | 3.0 | (2.3) | -0.3 | (1.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (1.1) | -0.3 | (1.7) | -0.7 | (4.3) | 1.0 | (2.1) | 1.4 | (1.7) |
| Costa Rica | 5.3 | (2.2) | 0.2 | (2.2) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (1.5) | 0.5 | (1.5) | -0.9 | (5.1) | 1.3 | (2.6) | -2.4 | (1.9) |
| Croatia | -0.9 | (3.5) | 6.0 | (2.8) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (1.7) | 1.0 | (1.8) | -20.5 | (7.7) | 0.5 | (2.1) | 2.8 | (2.4) |
| Cyprus* | 9.0 | (3.5) | -6.8 | (3.8) | -0.5 | (0.5) | 10.5 | (2.4) | -0.8 | (2.3) | 16.5 | (6.2) | -0.1 | (5.2) | -6.6 | (3.0) |
| Hong Kong-China | -4.7 | (4.1) | 9.2 | (4.9) | -0.3 | (0.2) | 7.6 | (2.2) | 19.8 | (5.3) | -8.0 | (15.9) | -5.5 | (6.2) | 3.1 | (4.5) |
| Indonesia | 3.7 | (3.2) | -4.1 | (3.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (2.1) | 3.5 | (1.4) | -13.9 | (6.7) | 6.4 | (3.4) | 3.5 | (2.5) |
| Jordan | 2.3 | (3.1) | -4.9 | (2.3) | -0.2 | (0.2) | -3.2 | (1.4) | 1.0 | (2.0) | -8.1 | (5.1) | 5.2 | (2.5) | 0.5 | (1.5) |
| Kazakhstan | -1.7 | (3.4) | 3.2 | (3.8) | 0.3 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (1.7) | 0.1 | (1.9) | -11.9 | (11.9) | -2.3 | (2.9) | -0.5 | (2.8) |
| Latvia | -1.6 | (3.1) | 4.9 | (2.8) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (1.7) | 4.9 | (8.0) | 4.6 | (3.2) | -0.8 | (2.8) |
| Lithuania | 2.3 | (3.2) | -0.4 | (2.6) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (1.2) | 0.4 | (1.4) | -6.9 | (6.2) | -2.8 | (3.0) | 0.9 | (2.2) |
| Macao-China | , |  |  |  | c | c | , | , | c |  | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Malaysia | 0.1 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (2.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (1.6) | 1.9 | (1.4) | -9.1 | (8.6) | -0.9 | (2.7) | -1.5 | (2.4) |
| Montenegro | c | c) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Peru | 2.3 | (2.5) | -3.3 | (2.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -1.7 | (1.1) | -1.7 | (1.2) | -0.2 | (5.2) | 2.6 | (2.2) | -0.3 | (1.9) |
| Qatar | 10.5 | (3.0) | -17.7 | (3.9) | -0.5 | (0.3) | -11.7 | (4.1) | 2.1 | (3.4) | 29.2 | (9.2) | 15.7 | (4.2) | -6.8 | (2.9) |
| Romania | 7.4 | (3.6) | -8.7 | (4.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 6.0 | (1.5) | 1.4 | (2.7) | 4.2 | (5.6) | -2.0 | (3.0) | 0.4 | (2.4) |
| Russian Federation | 1.8 | (4.0) | -3.5 | (3.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (1.1) | 1.5 | (1.5) | -21.0 | (12.8) | 2.4 | (2.6) | 3.8 | (2.8) |
| Serbia | -6.3 | (4.1) | 4.8 | (3.5) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 4.9 | (2.6) | 5.5 | (1.7) | 5.6 | (11.1) | 0.6 | (3.4) | 7.8 | (2.7) |
| Shanghai-China | -2.5 | (2.7) | -1.6 | (3.3) | -0.3 | (0.1) | 8.3 | (1.6) | -7.4 | (3.3) | -3.6 | (6.4) | 0.0 | (3.0) | 4.7 | (2.4) |
| Singapore | 0.4 | (3.2) | -5.4 | (3.7) | 0.3 | (0.1) | -0.5 | (1.7) | 15.6 | (5.1) | -15.5 | (8.2) | 2.4 | (4.0) | -1.3 | (3.0) |
| Chinese Taipei | 2.2 | (3.4) | -8.4 | (3.6) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 4.2 | (2.2) | 3.4 | (3.5) | -11.1 | (9.2) | 2.6 | (2.9) | 2.9 | (2.9) |
| Thailand | 3.1 | (3.2) | 1.7 | (2.9) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 7.1 | (1.3) | -1.4 | (3.0) | 10.2 | (10.6) | -2.5 | (4.0) | -0.6 | (3.6) |
| Tunisia | -4.2 | (3.4) | -4.4 | (3.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -3.6 | (1.9) | -1.7 | (2.3) | -1.0 | (7.4) | 4.0 | (3.4) | -0.6 | (2.1) |
| United Arab Emirates | 2.3 | (2.1) | -1.9 | (1.8) | -0.1 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 4.2 | (1.1) | -10.9 | (4.4) | 5.3 | (2.3) | 1.8 | (1.7) |
| Uruguay | -2.1 | (2.0) | 5.0 | (1.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (1.7) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 4.6 | (6.5) | 4.1 | (2.1) | 2.8 | (2.1) |
| Viet Nam | -2.9 | (4.3) | 2.2 | (3.7) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 6.4 | (1.7) | 2.6 | (1.8) | -8.3 | (14.3) | 7.8 | (3.5) | -6.0 | (3.2) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex


Relationship among mathematics performance, the school's learning environment, resources, policies


| © Albania | 4.9 (4.9) | -0.4 | (2.4) | 4.3 | (5.1) | 3.2 | (10.8) | -1.0 | (4.2) | 2.7 | (2.9) | -4.3 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (4.6) | 8.9 | (12.7) | -9.8 | (14.5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Argentina | c | -1.9 | (3.6) | 5.3 | (6.4) | -5.6 | (9.0) | 2.9 | (2.9) | -0.6 | (2.0) | -1.4 | (2.2) | -3.0 | (2.8) | 3.6 | (4.2) | -4.1 | (4.5) |
| ก Brazil | $0.4 \quad$ (3.9) | -0.2 | (1.9) | 0.3 | (3.2) | -17.3 | (12.0) | -5.2 | (2.1) | 3.5 | (1.9) | 0.5 | (2.2) | 5.3 | (2.1) | 3.9 | (5.6) | -7.1 | (5.9) |
| Bulgaria | 5.5 (2.0) | -4.2 | (6.7) | -6.5 | (7.0) | 26.6 | (25.5) | -2.5 | (4.3) | -1.1 | (3.9) | -5.1 | (3.2) | -1.3 | (4.4) | -5.3 | (10.8) | -6.1 | (12.6) |
| Colombia | -1.3 (2.4) | 2.8 | (2.0) | -3.6 | (5.9) | -24.8 | (8.1) | -7.3 | (2.9) | 6.7 | (2.0) | -1.3 | (1.9) | -1.6 | (2.3) | -11.0 | (4.5) | 20.8 | (7.1) |
| Costa Rica | -4.1 (6.2) | 9.9 | (3.8) | 2.4 | (4.8) | 16.0 | (17.0) | 4.7 | (3.5) | -6.2 | (2.6) | 4.3 | (3.0) | -3.3 | (3.6) | -1.7 | (3.8) | 2.3 | (7.9) |
| Croatia | -7.2 (9.1) | -10.5 | (4.9) | -3.2 | (4.6) | 14.8 | (28.8) | -0.7 | (3.9) | 3.1 | (3.2) | -4.2 | (2.7) | -1.3 | (3.5) | 9.5 | (4.5) | -7.8 | (6.7) |
| Cyprus* | -13.8 (4.7) | 20.2 | (6.3) | 2.9 | (4.9) | -5.9 | (12.6) | 5.6 | (4.5) | -1.4 | (3.2) | 8.1 | (4.1) | -11.0 | (4.8) | -10.8 | (12.8) | 9.5 | (8.8) |
| Hong Kong-China | -1.9 (4.6) | -0.8 | (3.6) | 23.2 | (27.9) | 41.4 | (23.1) | -9.3 | (5.7) | 3.8 | (5.1) | -0.2 | (6.1) | 0.4 | (5.5) | 3.1 | (12.7) | 2.6 | (10.7) |
| Indonesia | 4.9 (2.4) | -3.1 | (2.7) | -9.3 | (25.3) | -17.6 | (8.1) | 2.3 | (6.4) | -0.7 | (4.5) | 3.0 | (5.3) | -1.3 | (6.2) | -6.7 | (6.9) | 1.6 | (10.6) |
| Jordan | 1.4 (6.3) | 0.0 | (5.1) | -2.0 | (5.0) | -12.1 | (8.5) | -8.1 | (3.6) | -6.0 | (2.4) | 2.6 | (3.0) | 3.4 | (2.7) | -16.9 | (15.0) | -7.8 | (8.7) |
| Kazakhstan | -0.1 (4.9) | -3.6 | (5.0) | -6.9 | (6.5) | 18.5 | (15.9) | 10.8 | (4.9) | 2.8 | (3.3) | -0.2 | (2.6) | -10.8 | (5.0) | 3.4 | (8.3) | 4.1 | (5.4) |
| Latvia | -0.1 (2.0) | 6.2 | (2.8) | -24.4 | (6.3) | 40.5 | (14.3) | 5.5 | (3.3) | 2.1 | (3.5) | 0.0 | (2.6) | -7.2 | (3.2) | -4.0 | (20.2) | 5.4 | (9.4) |
| Lithuania | 1.0 (1.7) | -5.4 | (2.3) | -13.2 | (5.2) | 85.4 | (18.3) | -2.9 | (3.6) | -1.2 | (2.6) | -4.6 | (2.9) | 3.5 | (3.6) | -7.3 | (6.1) | -1.7 | (5.5) |
| Macao-China | C | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | c |
| Malaysia | 2.4 (10.6) | -4.5 | (3.7) | -4.1 | (5.0) | -12.6 | (33.7) | -5.1 | (3.3) | -6.1 | (2.9) | 0.5 | (3.2) | 4.6 | (2.7) | -4.1 | (13.4) | 10.0 | (7.3) |
| Montenegro | c c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | c | C | c | c | c | c | c |
| Peru | 2.1 (2.8) | 2.0 | (2.1) | 4.1 | (4.7) | -2.5 | (9.0) | -3.2 | (2.5) | 5.0 | (2.8) | -1.4 | (2.5) | -2.2 | (3.0) | 7.9 | (4.8) | 1.0 | (6.4) |
| Qatar | 13.4 (9.1) | 2.5 | (6.1) | 8.1 | (6.8) | -38.6 | (17.0) | -9.5 | (5.2) | 5.9 | (4.3) | 2.5 | (3.8) | -1.7 | (4.7) | 15.4 | (8.8) | -6.8 | (15.3) |
| Romania | 8.1 (6.6) | -0.8 | (3.3) | -8.6 | (4.8) | -19.9 | (18.9) | 0.4 | (3.1) | 1.8 | (3.2) | -4.6 | (2.7) | 1.9 | (3.0) | -5.4 | (4.8) | 11.0 | (4.8) |
| Russian Federation | 0.8 (3.1) | -5.2 | (2.9) | -0.7 | (7.2) | 13.4 | (23.3) | -1.9 | (4.9) | 1.2 | (3.8) | -3.7 | (3.6) | 5.2 | (4.9) | -9.9 | (5.8) | -15.1 | (8.7) |
| Serbia | 15.2 (12.2) | 6.1 | (14.8) | 9.1 | (9.4) | 75.9 | (43.0) | -1.7 | (4.4) | -2.8 | (4.4) | 3.3 | (4.0) | -1.2 | (5.0) | 0.5 | (6.0) | 5.3 | (7.2) |
| Shanghai-China | 2.1 (3.9) | -4.5 | (3.7) | 1.6 | (6.2) | -2.6 | (11.6) | -5.3 | (4.4) | 2.6 | (3.7) | 0.2 | (3.6) | -1.8 | (4.1) | -0.3 | (10.9) | -5.4 | (11.0) |
| Singapore | -3.2 (4.9) | 0.7 | (2.7) | 12.2 | (16.4) | 31.4 | (20.7) | -6.8 | (5.2) | -3.7 | (3.8) | 0.3 | (3.7) | 3.0 | (3.9) | 2.3 | (4.8) | -7.9 | (19.5) |
| Chinese Taipei | -3.8 (3.2) | 1.3 | (2.7) | -8.2 | (11.0) | 24.2 | (9.4) | 5.2 | (6.0) | 3.2 | (4.6) | -9.4 | (5.5) | -1.1 | (3.5) | -3.9 | (6.8) | -1.1 | (6.0) |
| Thailand | 0.8 (1.8) | 8.3 | (3.1) | 2.3 | (7.5) | -1.3 | (13.9) | 9.7 | (4.7) | -1.4 | (3.6) | 3.2 | (3.4) | -10.7 | (4.3) | -2.8 | (10.2) | -5.1 | (5.9) |
| Tunisia | -2.6 (4.1) | 2.9 | (3.3) | -3.2 | (6.1) | 6.5 | (24.7) | -2.9 | (2.7) | -2.8 | (2.8) | 1.3 | (2.8) | 1.7 | (2.9) | -3.7 | (7.0) | -0.3 | (5.3) |
| United Arab Emirates | 3.4 (2.2) | 1.8 | (2.3) | -7.8 | (5.4) | 24.6 | (6.5) | 2.4 | (3.5) | -5.3 | (1.9) | -1.6 | (1.9) | 0.9 | (2.7) | -10.8 | (6.8) | 10.1 | (10.9) |
| Uruguay | -3.3 (5.9) | 0.5 | (4.4) | 6.5 | (3.9) | -3.1 | (14.3) | -3.4 | (2.4) | -0.7 | (2.6) | 1.2 | (2.2) | -0.4 | (2.3) | 2.9 | (3.8) | -1.6 | (6.3) |
| Viet Nam | -1.3 (4.1) | 0.8 | (6.2) | -2.8 | (6.4) | 32.9 | (12.0) | -2.6 | (4.4) | -1.3 | (4.2) | -0.1 | (3.9) | 9.1 | (6.2) | 1.4 | (6.2) | -27.2 | (13.7) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 4/5]
Relationship among mathematics performance, the school's learning environment, resources, policies

|  | Assessment and accountability policies ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Learning environment and school climate at the school level ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 皆 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q Australia | -1.0 (1.2) | 2.8 (3.1) | 5.3 (4.4) | -2.4 (3.2) | -5.0 (4.9) | 8.8 (7.5) | 26.9 (5.9) | -0.5 (2.1) | 2.8 (2.4) | -3.2 (1.8) | 1.9 (1.0) | 3.6 (1.0) |
| Austria | -1.9 (2.1) | 4.5 (9.7) | 3.4 (5.8) | 8.0 (6.6) | 3.9 (7.3) | 36.2 (10.9) | 36.0 (9.0) | -2.4 (3.4) | 3.7 (2.8) | -9.7 (3.6) | 1.6 (2.0) | $0.4 \quad$ (3.5) |
| - Belgium | -1.1 (1.5) | 11.0 (15.6) | 3.1 (3.5) | 5.9 (3.8) | 6.4 (5.5) | -6.6 (9.0) | 28.2 (7.5) | 2.9 (2.7) | 2.1 (2.2) | -2.7 (2.4) | 4.6 (1.7) | 9.5 (3.1) |
| Canada | -2.5 (1.6) | 5.9 (2.7) | -0.8 (4.6) | 3.7 (2.9) | -8.3 (4.2) | -10.6 (6.7) | 23.2 (6.7) | -3.2 (2.0) | 8.9 (2.0) | 3.7 (1.7) | 4.3 (1.0) | 4.8 (1.2) |
| Chile | 1.9 (1.4) | -3.0 (2.8) | -0.6 (3.7) | -7.3 (3.1) | 5.1 (3.8) | -1.7 (6.9) | 13.2 (5.4) | 5.3 (2.3) | -1.3 (1.8) | 1.1 (1.8) | 4.8 (1.1) | 4.8 (2.3) |
| Czech Republic | 1.2 (1.7) | 0.8 (4.7) | 0.8 (5.2) | -3.6 (5.4) | 0.9 (10.3) | -5.6 (11.3) | 29.3 (6.7) | -3.9 (4.2) | 4.6 (3.7) | -5.4 (3.2) | 2.1 (1.7) | 7.5 (3.4) |
| Denmark | 3.7 (1.4) | -2.7 (3.2) | -2.1 (4.1) | -3.0 (3.3) | -2.0 (3.3) | 5.6 (8.3) | 24.3 (7.2) | 0.4 (2.7) | 0.8 (2.7) | -2.1 (2.1) | 0.7 (1.0) | 3.9 (2.2) |
| Estonia | -0.3 (1.5) | -0.1 (3.6) | -3.0 (5.1) | -0.1 (4.1) | 8.8 (4.2) | -1.0 (8.9) | 16.7 (5.8) | 3.8 (2.4) | 0.0 (2.3) | 2.6 (2.1) | 2.8 (1.1) | 6.1 (2.0) |
| Finland | 0.2 (1.1) | 11.9 (13.4) | -3.6 (2.7) | $0.4 \quad$ (2.8) | 1.1 (3.0) | 3.1 (6.8) | -1.5 (6.9) | -2.4 (1.8) | 6.2 (2.6) | -0.4 (1.8) | 4.3 (1.2) | 0.6 (2.0) |
| France | 3.5 (1.7) | 8.0 (4.2) | -4.6 (4.6) | 2.6 (6.4) | -6.2 (4.9) | -7.5 (9.9) | 19.9 (7.1) | -6.0 (3.4) | 6.2 (3.0) | 1.6 (2.2) | 6.0 (1.4) | 2.2 (2.7) |
| Germany | -0.9 (1.9) | -0.8 (7.5) | 6.1 (4.6) | 1.4 (4.8) | 3.3 (4.0) | -33.2 (9.1) | 13.9 (6.7) | 0.7 (3.4) | 4.1 (3.9) | -5.5 (2.7) | 1.4 (1.8) | -0.1 (4.5) |
| Greece | 2.7 (1.5) | -6.4 (5.0) | 2.2 (3.7) | -7.9 (5.6) | -8.7 (5.8) | 0.9 (9.3) | 20.8 (10.3) | 0.0 (2.4) | -0.4 (3.1) | -1.5 (2.1) | -1.4 (2.1) | 5.3 (2.0) |
| Hungary | 2.8 (2.9) | 2.7 (4.7) | -5.1 (5.2) | 10.4 (5.8) | -3.7 (5.7) | -10.6 (9.6) | 29.7 (8.4) | -0.6 (3.7) | -1.9 (3.3) | 3.7 (3.0) | 6.1 (1.7) | -1.3 (2.8) |
| Iceland | 5.0 (3.5) | 1.4 (5.9) | -4.7 (7.8) | 4.4 (4.7) | 1.3 (6.5) | 6.7 (9.9) | 25.8 (11.1) | -6.2 (4.7) | 0.5 (5.1) | -1.7 (3.2) | 5.6 (2.1) | 2.0 (9.5) |
| Ireland | -3.7 (1.7) | 7.9 (4.7) | 0.7 (3.3) | 3.0 (3.4) | 2.5 (3.2) | -2.8 (8.4) | 16.0 (6.8) | -3.1 (2.2) | 5.9 (2.5) | -2.8 (2.3) | 4.0 (1.4) | 0.8 (4.6) |
| Israel | 0.5 (4.5) | 8.2 (6.4) | -15.3 (11.9) | 1.5 (5.6) | -6.2 (9.6) | -30.0 (11.4) | 48.3 (12.0) | -2.3 (5.1) | -0.8 (4.2) | 3.1 (3.2) | -0.1 (2.2) | 7.6 (2.9) |
| Italy | 2.7 (1.3) | 0.8 (2.7) | -1.2 (2.9) | 3.5 (2.5) | -2.9 (2.9) | -31.0 (5.8) | 24.6 (5.1) | -2.5 (1.9) | 6.6 (1.9) | -0.8 (1.6) | 9.7 (1.0) | 8.9 (0.9) |
| Japan | 2.5 (2.3) | 4.2 (9.0) | 5.6 (10.4) | -7.3 (6.2) | -11.9 (8.0) | 24.0 (12.4) | 28.5 (12.5) | -4.1 (3.8) | -0.9 (3.6) | 2.3 (3.2) | 5.2 (3.9) | 21.8 (8.1) |
| Korea | 5.6 (3.2) | 7.7 (5.8) | -18.5 (9.4) | -11.3 (7.9) | 9.2 (8.8) | 29.4 (13.8) | 35.7 (12.3) | -2.8 (2.8) | 3.3 (3.4) | 0.4 (3.0) | 4.9 (1.9) | $25.4 \quad$ (9.3) |
| Luxembourg | c | c | c | c |  | c | c c | , | c | C c | C c | C |
| Mexico | 0.2 (1.3) | -4.5 (2.2) | 3.6 (4.4) | 3.9 (2.7) | 0.4 (2.1) | -6.6 (4.8) | 23.5 (4.0) | 0.1 (1.7) | 1.2 (1.5) | 0.2 (1.2) | 1.4 (0.7) | 5.7 (0.9) |
| Netherlands | -2.5 (3.0) | 1.7 (8.3) | -10.3 (5.7) | -9.1 (10.3) | 15.7 (17.7) | 17.4 (15.5) | 16.9 (12.1) | -7.7 (5.7) | 2.9 (4.6) | -1.5 (3.2) | 7.2 (1.9) | 14.1 (6.6) |
| New Zealand | -9.1 (5.5) | 5.6 (5.3) | 11.3 (6.0) | -30.1 (13.4) | -5.9 (13.9) | -19.6 (9.4) | 30.7 (7.7) | -3.4 (2.9) | 1.8 (2.7) | 6.3 (2.0) | 3.0 (1.7) | 10.9 (2.3) |
| Norway | -3.0 (1.4) | 6.9 (3.9) | -6.2 (6.0) | 5.5 (4.0) | 1.9 (4.3) | 7.4 (10.4) | 47.0 (8.8) | 10.6 (3.8) | -2.4 (3.5) | -1.5 (2.8) | 1.0 (1.5) | 7.6 (3.9) |
| Poland | -3.6 (3.3) | 1.7 (4.3) | 3.4 (4.3) | 1.7 (4.9) | -7.6 (7.7) | -4.8 (9.4) | 20.6 (7.1) | 2.4 (4.0) | -0.1 (3.5) | -0.3 (2.8) | 2.8 (1.4) | 5.5 (2.2) |
| Portugal | -0.7 (3.0) | 4.9 (3.5) | -9.9 (6.6) | 3.1 (4.4) | 5.9 (4.5) | -0.6 (9.6) | 27.6 (10.7) | 0.1 (2.7) | 1.4 (1.9) | 0.1 (2.2) | -0.3 (1.3) | 3.7 (2.5) |
| Slovak Republic | -3.7 (2.0) | -3.8 (5.4) | 0.9 (4.8) | -5.1 (5.2) | -25.4 (7.8) | -0.8 (12.6) | 46.0 (9.6) | 3.4 (4.5) | -5.3 (4.5) | 2.5 (3.4) | 6.5 (2.1) | 3.9 (3.1) |
| Slovenia | -2.5 (1.8) | 0.2 (4.2) | -3.8 (4.8) | -4.9 (4.3) | -3.4 (4.0) | -1.1 (10.2) | 21.8 (6.5) | 2.3 (2.7) | 0.6 (3.5) | -1.0 (2.4) | 0.7 (1.7) | 11.8 (1.8) |
| Spain | -0.5 (1.6) | -5.4 (3.3) | 4.2 (3.5) | 3.9 (3.1) | -4.4 (3.3) | 5.6 (6.4) | 8.6 (5.0) | -2.7 (2.1) | 4.3 (2.0) | -0.5 (1.6) | 0.8 (1.0) | 6.3 (1.1) |
| Sweden | 0.0 (2.5) | 2.3 (5.2) | w w | -0.7 (5.0) | -0.8 (4.0) | 10.0 (8.5) | 18.3 (9.8) | -4.0 (2.8) | 2.5 (3.4) | 0.9 (2.8) | 4.9 (1.5) | 3.5 (3.5) |
| Switzerland | 1.4 (1.4) | 2.4 (9.3) | -0.1 (3.9) | -1.4 (4.7) | 3.5 (4.0) | 18.0 (7.6) | 29.5 (8.9) | 2.1 (3.0) | 1.1 (3.1) | -2.5 (2.5) | -1.2 (1.7) | 7.7 (3.7) |
| Turkey | 2.8 (2.9) | 4.1 (5.2) | 10.4 (15.2) | 2.8 (7.2) | -10.8 (7.4) | -44.9 (11.5) | 93.4 (12.5) | -6.2 (3.5) | 4.4 (3.7) | 6.1 (2.9) | 2.1 (2.5) | -3.7 (2.2) |
| United Kingdom | -2.4 (4.2) | 2.5 (7.0) | -13.8 (8.0) | -0.5 (4.5) | -1.6 (6.2) | 5.8 (9.1) | 35.6 (6.4) | 3.7 (2.5) | -5.7 (3.1) | 2.0 (2.5) | 6.2 (1.6) | 3.4 (2.1) |
| United States | -6.2 (2.9) | 1.5 (10.0) | -6.3 (21.0) | -1.1 (4.4) | 58.4 (22.5) | 26.4 (10.9) | 19.8 (12.3) | -1.0 (2.8) | 3.2 (3.8) | 0.5 (2.6) | 5.2 (1.6) | -2.2 (2.6) |
| OECD average | -0.3 (0.4) | 2.6 (1.1) | -2.1 (1.3) | -0.9 (1.0) | 0.4 (1.4) | -0.4 (1.7) | 27.2 (1.5) | -0.8 (0.6) | 1.8 (0.6) | -0.2 (0.4) | 3.3 (0.3) | 5.8 (0.7) |


| Albania | -4.1 (2.8) | 1.7 (6.5) | -17.5 (5.7) | -11.0 (6.3) | -9.0 (8.9) | -9.6 (10.9) | -11.3 | (11.8) | 0.1 | (2.8) | -1.9 | (3.1) | 1.4 | (3.2) | 0.5 | (2.2) | -0.2 | (2.9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 0.1 (1.8) | 3.5 (6.3) | -6.0 (4.4) | 2.2 (4.0) | 0.6 (3.7) | -34.7 (10.1) | 19.7 | (9.4) | 0.3 | (2.8) | 1.6 | (2.3) | 4.4 | (3.1) | 4.9 | (1.3) | 4.4 | (1.5) |
| ๕ Brazil | 0.6 (1.7) | -1.7 (3.3) | -1.3 (4.7) | -1.2 (3.0) | 6.8 (4.8) | -5.3 (6.3) | 32.6 | (6.0) | 0.4 | (1.9) | 0.3 | (1.7) | -0.1 | (1.6) | 2.4 | (0.9) | 0.7 | (1.1) |
| Bulgaria | 0.7 (4.5) | 15.3 (5.2) | 2.4 (8.0) | 7.4 (7.3) | 2.1 (5.1) | -9.9 (9.4) | 30.3 | (11.4) | -4.8 | (2.3) | 6.0 | (2.7) | 5.1 | (3.2) | 4.1 | (1.8) | 5.2 | (1.9) |
| Colombia | 3.3 (3.2) | 1.5 (3.4) | -3.2 (4.5) | 12.9 (3.8) | -6.1 (4.2) | -27.1 (8.8) | 16.9 | (7.7) | -2.3 | (2.0) | 6.0 | (2.5) | -0.4 | (2.2) | 1.0 | (1.0) | 3.3 | (2.6) |
| Costa Rica | -0.5 (1.8) | 6.4 (5.5) | 2.9 (12.8) | -3.0 (3.7) | -1.5 (4.4) | -6.1 (10.5) | 26.5 | (10.1) | -0.4 | (3.3) | 1.1 | (2.6) | 4.8 | (2.2) | -0.3 | (1.1) | 2.7 | (1.8) |
| Croatia | -1.6 (2.3) | 1.9 (3.9) | -0.1 (6.5) | -8.9 (3.7) | -5.8 (24.7) | 12.3 (12.0) | 12.1 | (8.9) | -2.4 | (3.0) | 0.9 | (3.0) | -0.4 | (2.5) | 8.8 | (2.1) | 12.8 | (2.7) |
| Cyprus* | 4.7 (1.7) | 4.9 (9.2) | 12.7 (6.6) | -1.1 (4.4) | 4.3 (9.0) | 23.9 (15.7) | 67.0 | (13.1) | 1.5 | (5.7) | -2.3 | (5.1) | -5.7 | (2.4) | -3.9 | (2.2) | 11.9 | (2.3) |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.2 (4.4) | -3.6 (7.2) | 1.7 (6.1) | -2.1 (7.3) | -2.8 (8.8) | -11.3 (21.0) | 8.4 | (13.6) | 6.5 | (4.5) | -1.2 | (4.0) | 6.0 | (4.1) | -0.6 | (4.4) | 13.6 | (8.2) |
| Indonesia | -7.3 (4.7) | -5.2 (7.1) | 1.6 (6.0) | 11.8 (9.7) |  | -4.6 (13.9) | 6.3 | (12.8) | 0.9 | (3.2) | 0.1 | (4.2) | -1.3 | (3.1) | 6.7 | (1.9) | 2.2 | (3.3) |
| Jordan | 3.3 (2.7) | -10.6 (5.7) | 4.1 (5.2) | 4.1 (4.8) | -0.4 (4.0) | -3.1 (9.2) | 50.2 | (9.9) | -2.2 | (2.5) | 1.7 | (2.3) | 6.7 | (2.5) | 0.7 | (1.8) | 3.4 | (1.9) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.7 (19.3) | 4.6 (11.4) |  | -5.4 (11.4) | -5.3 (17.1) | -11.4 (13.8) | 28.7 | (12.9) | -4.2 | (2.8) | 4.4 | (2.8) | -2.6 | (2.9) | -0.6 | (2.6) | 0.9 | (2.9) |
| Latvia | -6.7 (10.7) | 4.0 (4.7) | 2.1 (6.7) | 6.3 (5.2) | 2.2 (4.9) | 1.8 (8.5) | 4.1 | (7.7) | 0.5 | (2.7) | 1.6 | (2.8) | 1.1 | (3.0) | 4.3 | (1.4) | . | (1.7) |
| Lithuania | 4.0 (2.0) | 1.3 (4.5) | -3.1 (5.1) | -7.4 (4.9) | -3.9 (3.7) | 7.7 (8.2) | 28.0 | (6.4) | 3.7 | (3.7) | -4.7 | (3.5) | 1.6 | (2.7) | 4.8 | (1.3) | 3.0 | (1.9) |
| Macao-China | c c | c c | c c | c c | c c | c c | c | c | c | c | c |  | c |  | c |  | c | c |
| Malaysia | -8.6 (3.8) | -9.5 (5.7) | 12.8 (17.3) | 5.4 (4.2) | 1.1 (5.3) | -10.5 (11.6) | 53.8 | (12.9) | 6.9 | (2.3) | -3.6 | (2.5) | -1.7 | (2.1) | 6.1 | (1.7) | 1.4 | (1.5) |
| Montenegro |  | c c | C c | c c | c c | c c | c | c | c |  | c |  | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Peru | 2.3 (1.5) | -8.2 (6.9) | -0.8 (4.1) | 1.5 (4.9) | -11.6 (13.1) | -8.7 (8.4) | 21.8 | (10.3) | 1.4 | (2.4) | -2.2 | (2.9) | 1.3 | (3.0) | 3.0 | (1.1) | 1 | (2.2) |
| Qatar | -13.1 (3.9) | -3.8 (5.3) | -47.9 (15.2) | -33.6 (11.4) |  | 12.5 (16.1) | 55.5 | (15.0) | -0.2 | (3.2) | -2.1 | (3.2) | 3.0 | (3.2) | 9.3 | (3.1) | . 4 | (3.5) |
| Romania | -0.4 (2.3) | 5.6 (4.8) | -2.9 (5.6) | -6.3 (5.7) | 1.1 (6.3) | -10.8 (12.1) | 31.2 | (9.1) | -0.7 | (2.8) | 0.1 | (2.6) | 2.3 | (2.6) | 2.8 | (1.8) | 0.9 | (2.2) |
| Russian Federation | 5.9 (8.4) | 0.3 (5.3) | 32.4 (20.1) | 2.6 (5.5) | -3.6 (10.2) | -21.6 (13.7) | 18.5 | (9.5) | 0.7 | (3.1) | 4.0 | (2.8) | 2.7 | (3.0) | 2.9 | (1.8) | 5.0 | (2.6) |
| Serbia | 2.3 (3.2) | 1.2 (6.3) | -9.0 (6.2) | 6.6 (5.9) | 16.0 (13.1) | -13.0 (17.1) | 25.8 | (12.0) | 2.0 | (3.6) | 1.2 | (5.2) | -3.1 | (3.7) | 9.0 | (2.1) | 5.4 | (4.2) |
| Shanghai-China | 2.9 (3.0) | 2.0 (12.0) | -12.8 (5.9) | -11.7 (8.3) | 26.1 (18.4) | -0.3 (14.2) | 48.5 | (12.6) | 0.1 | (2.8) | 1.2 | (2.2) | -1.8 | (2.3) | 3.9 | (2.5) | 4.1 | (16.8) |
| Singapore | -10.2 (13.3) | 1.8 (4.8) | 8.0 (24.7) | 5.8 (10.6) | -8.4 (20.4) | 15.3 (15.2) | 26.1 | (10.9) | 1.6 | (3.9) | 4.5 | (4.4) | 5.2 | (2.4) | 3.5 | (2.9) | 0.0 | (3.1) |
| Chinese Taipei | -3.9 (2.1) | 8.4 (6.5) | 6.4 (6.0) | -1.0 (5.7) | 2.4 (5.6) | 19.0 (16.4) | 7.6 | (14.2) | 5.1 | (2.8) | -1.8 | (2.9) | 2.0 | (3.3) | 1.7 | (2.4) | 15.1 | (5.9) |
| Thailand | 3.6 (4.0) | 6.5 (6.1) | 38.0 (13.8) | 5.6 (5.5) | -12.9 (13.2) | -13.8 (16.9) | 15.8 | (17.9) | 6.7 | (4.2) | 7.1 | (4.0) | -3.6 | (3.1) | 2.0 | (1.6) | 7.3 | (2.4) |
| Tunisia | -3.2 (2.3) | 4.2 (8.8) | -0.6 (5.6) | 5.8 (6.3) | -4.0 (6.3) | -30.1 (15.1) | 67.4 | (14.1) | 1.3 | (3.9) | -4.1 | (3.8) | 0.8 | (2.4) | 2.2 | (2.3) | 8.7 | (2.1) |
| United Arab Emirates | 10.2 (4.1) | -8.5 (3.8) | -3.1 (6.1) | -7.4 (4.7) | -1.3 (7.4) | 1.2 (7.8) | 24.4 | (6.9) | 0.7 | (2.0) | 3.0 | (2.3) | 2.3 | (2.1) | 8.7 | (1.3) | 2.1 | (1.5) |
| Uruguay | 3.4 (1.8) | 1.5 (6.9) | 3.4 (4.6) | -0.6 (3.9) | -3.2 (4.5) | -16.8 (10.5) | 28.0 | 9.3) | -1.1 | (3.2) | 0.8 | (2.2) | 1.0 | (2.6) | 0.7 | (1.8) | 2.1 | (2.1) |
| Viet Nam | 5.3 (7.6) | 4.9 (7.3) | -9.7 (9.1) | 14.7 (7.0) | -0.1 (20.2) | -45.6 (16.3) | 68.8 | (18.2) | -3.7 | (4.7) | 6.1 | (5.3) | 3.1 | (4.1) | -0.7 | (3.5) | 11.6 | (4.8) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
StatLink (aitाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384

Relationship among mathematics performance, the school's learning environment, resources, policies


| $\sim$ Albania | -1.2 | (3.1) | 2.5 | (12.1) | 9.4 | (12.7) | C | C | C | C | C C | C | c | C | C | -10.0 | (6.5) | 6.9 | (7.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® Argentina }}{ }$ | -15.5 | (2.3) | 8.5 | (3.0) | 6.5 | (8.5) | 10.7 | (1.3) | 1.8 | (0.7) | 10.8 (5.8) | -1.2 | (1.5) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -7.6 | (6.2) | -0.2 | (5.0) |
| Brazil | -20.0 | (1.5) | 16.0 | (4.8) | 6.8 | (8.2) | 8.4 | (1.5) | 0.3 | (0.5) | 29.2 (4.1) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 9.3 | (4.5) | -10.7 | (3.3) |
| - Bulgaria | -14.5 | (2.1) | 0.9 | (6.0) | 9.2 | (4.4) | 10.8 | (1.3) | 0.1 | (0.7) | 38.1 (7.3) | -1.0 | (2.6) | 0.1 | (0.2) | -3.6 | (6.3) | 9.0 | (6.5) |
| Colombia | -24.3 | (2.1) | 7.6 | (5.8) | 24.7 | (12.1) | 13.2 | (2.4) | 1.3 | (0.7) | 18.8 (5.1) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 15.5 | (6.9) | -1.7 | (5.8) |
| Costa Rica | -23.0 | (1.8) | 3.3 | (2.9) | -9.6 | (10.8) | 11.9 | (1.5) | 1.4 | (0.6) | 17.5 (4.6) | -1.3 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (4.3) | -0.8 | (6.4) |
| Croatia | -24.6 | (2.5) | 2.6 | (2.4) | 9.4 | (8.5) | 9.4 | (1.6) | -1.5 | (1.1) | 44.7 (11.8) | 0.2 | (5.0) | 0.1 | (0.3) | -6.1 | (6.0) | 7.6 | (5.3) |
| Cyprus* | -15.8 | (2.6) | 5.3 | (3.1) | 2.4 | (6.0) | 19.7 | (1.9) | 1.1 | (1.3) | 20.6 (12.4) | -23.3 | (5.0) | 1.4 | (0.4) | 8.5 | (9.0) | 13.6 | (9.7) |
| Hong Kong-China | -22.1 | (2.9) | -6.8 | (3.2) | 24.5 | (5.5) | 6.4 | (2.3) | 1.1 | (1.1) | 25.6 (8.2) | -7.2 | (5.4) | 0.3 | (0.2) | c | c | c | c |
| Indonesia | -5.8 | (1.8) | 8.1 | (8.8) | -12.5 | (2.3) | 8.8 | (2.5) | 0.7 | (0.6) | 15.5 (6.8) | 5.3 | (2.6) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 8.1 | (7.9) | 7.3 | (9.5) |
| Jordan | -1.0 | (7.5) | -10.8 | (2.5) | 8.2 | (5.1) | 11.5 | (1.6) | 0.5 | (0.7) | 33.4 (8.8) | -3.0 | (1.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 8.3 | (6.8) | 10.9 | (5.0) |
| Kazakhstan | -2.0 | (1.8) | -3.5 | (2.2) | 2.9 | (4.6) | 14.8 | (2.1) | -0.2 | (1.4) | 33.8 (9.8) | -3.7 | (1.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 18.8 | (14.7) | 13.2 | (9.1) |
| Latvia | -2.4 | (2.9) | 6.2 | (3.0) | 5.8 | (5.6) | 21.0 | (1.7) | -1.8 | (1.4) | 37.4 (7.0) | -3.7 | (3.4) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 2.9 | (7.9) | 4.4 | (8.4) |
| Lithuania | -9.7 | (2.4) | 3.8 | (4.0) | 20.4 | (8.3) | 17.8 | (1.6) | -1.7 | (1.5) | 44.6 (7.2) | 2.2 | (2.9) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -4.7 | (6.2) | -6.8 | (6.4) |
| Macao-China | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | c | c c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Malaysia | 3.9 | (2.1) | -3.2 | (4.4) | -0.8 | (3.6) | 19.6 | (2.2) | 2.8 | (0.8) | 14.3 (5.9) | -0.6 | (1.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 2.7 | (5.4) | 0.6 | (6.3) |
| Montenegro | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | c | c | c C | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Peru | -26.6 | (2.0) | 20.2 | (6.5) | 16.2 | (5.2) | 10.4 | (1.7) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 31.6 (5.6) | 3.1 | (1.1) | -0.1 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (7.1) | 0.5 | (5.7) |
| Qatar | 8.0 | (8.9) | -34.2 | (2.4) | 13.1 | (4.4) | 10.7 | (2.4) | 0.0 | (0.9) | 30.0 (10.2) | 3.4 | (1.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 23.7 | (9.8) | 17.1 | (9.6) |
| Romania | -12.6 | (2.4) | 4.8 | (7.2) | 8.5 | (9.5) | 18.2 | (1.9) | 2.3 | (0.9) | 27.4 (7.4) | -0.5 | (1.8) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -8.2 | (7.1) | 6.7 | (6.0) |
| Russian Federation | -1.7 | (2.6) | 3.7 | (2.5) | 14.7 | (5.2) | 24.8 | (2.3) | -2.7 | (1.7) | 15.6 (9.2) | 1.8 | (2.5) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (15.7) | -2.9 | (16.9) |
| Serbia | -24.3 | (2.5) | -6.8 | (2.6) | -7.8 | (6.4) | 7.5 | (1.4) | -0.6 | (1.2) | 57.1 (11.1) | -1.1 | (2.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -3.7 | (9.4) | -2.3 | (7.5) |
| Shanghai-China | -14.1 | (2.4) | 23.3 | (9.7) | 60.9 | (9.9) | 5.0 | (1.9) | -4.2 | (1.3) | 29.8 (9.2) | -1.1 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c |
| Singapore | 1.1 | (2.6) | -13.0 | (2.7) | 8.8 | (2.8) | 17.9 | (2.2) | -1.6 | (1.3) | 36.4 (9.3) | 7.9 | (2.4) | -0.1 | (0.1) | c | c | c | C |
| Chinese Taipei | -7.0 | (2.6) | 7.8 | (5.9) | 15.4 | (3.8) | 22.5 | (2.1) | -2.8 | (1.4) | 43.9 (11.4) | 1.7 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.0) | -4.3 | (8.7) | 8.8 | (6.0) |
| Thailand | -0.9 | (2.0) | -11.9 | (9.3) | -12.5 | (3.1) | 16.6 | (1.9) | 3.2 | (0.7) | 6.7 (6.2) | 1.9 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.0 | (5.7) | 11.9 | (5.6) |
| Tunisia | -23.4 | (1.9) | 3.0 | (5.6) | 3.0 | (9.9) | 12.5 | (1.8) | 2.7 | (0.6) | 30.8 (5.8) | 0.8 | (3.0) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -9.9 | (6.8) | 0.7 | (7.1) |
| United Arab Emirates | -18.9 | (4.1) | -25.6 | (2.2) | 6.1 | (2.5) | 13.6 | (1.4) | 1.3 | (0.8) | 40.6 (6.2) | 1.8 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.8 | (5.2) | 4.3 | (6.2) |
| Uruguay | -18.0 | (2.1) | 3.3 | (4.2) | -12.1 | (7.6) | 16.6 | (1.7) | 1.7 | (0.8) | 17.8 (6.9) | 2.0 | (1.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 8.3 | (6.3) | 6.2 | (5.4) |
| Viet Nam | -24.2 | (2.1) | 14.0 | (10.2) | 11.9 | (7.1) | 9.9 | (2.5) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 9.8 (8.9) | 4.8 | (1.8) | -0.1 | (0.0) | 8.3 | (15.0) | 16.0 | (15.4) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3),

1. Multilevel regression model (student and school levels): Mathematics performance is regressed on all the variables presented in this table.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV．1．13 School autonomy and performance，by system＇s extent of posting achievement data publicly

|  | OECD countries （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  | All countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross model |  | Net model |  | Gross model |  | Net model |  |
|  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| School autonomy for resource allocation | 2.54 | （1．99） | －6．13 | （1．81） | 7.04 | （1．47） | －4．37 | （0．98） |
| $\times$ Percentage of students in schools that post achievement data publicly（additional 10\％） | 0.61 | （0．34） | 0.69 | （0．28） | 0.01 | （0．25） | 0.56 | （0．18） |
| School autonomy for curriculum and assessment | 0.56 | （1．65） | －0．16 | （1．13） | －2．39 | （1．27） | －3．61 | （0．79） |
| $\times$ Percentage of students in schools that post achievement data publicly（additional 10\％） | －0．13 | （0．33） | －0．04 | （0．22） | 0.45 | （0．30） | 0.73 | （0．18） |
| Private school |  |  | 0.46 | （1．74） |  |  | 0.03 | （1．31） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS） |  |  | 18.20 | （0．31） |  |  | 18.78 | （0．29） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS squared） |  |  | 3.12 | （0．22） |  |  | 4.25 | （0．16） |
| Student is a female |  |  | －13．60 | （0．56） |  |  | －11．05 | （0．40） |
| Student＇s language at home is the same as the language of assessment |  |  | 6.96 | （1．29） |  |  | 5.61 | （0．97） |
| Student without an immigrant background |  |  | 10.62 | （1．00） |  |  | 0.84 | （0．89） |
| School average PISA index of economic，social and cultural status |  |  | 65.19 | （1．05） |  |  | 60.06 | （0．88） |
| School in a city（100 000 or more people） |  |  | －5．81 | （1．14） |  |  | －4．16 | （0．84） |
| School in a small town or village（ 15000 or less people） |  |  | 5.38 | （1．26） |  |  | 6.66 | （0．95） |
| School size（100 students） |  |  | 2.60 | （0．23） |  |  | 1.78 | （0．16） |
| School size（100 students，squared） |  |  | －0．05 | （0．01） |  |  | －0．02 | （0．00） |
| N | 256739 |  | 256739 |  | 420028 |  | 420028 |  |

Notes：Estimates significant at the $5 \%$ level（ $p<0.05$ ）are in bold and those significant at the $10 \%$ level（ $p<0.10$ ）are in italics．Both net and gross models include country fixed effects，estimate no intercept，are run with using BRR weights to account for the sampling design．Each country contribute to the analysis with equal weights． StatLink ज्ञाता http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Table IV．1．14 School autonomy and performance，by system＇s extent of implementing a standardised policy

|  | OECD countries （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  | All countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross model |  | Net model |  | Gross model |  | Net model |  |
|  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| School autonomy for resource allocation | 13.88 | （2．69） | －0．25 | （2．08） | 8.93 | （2．08） | －4．21 | （1．55） |
| $\times$ Percentage of students in schools that implement a standardised policy for mathematics （additional 10\％） | －1．27 | （0．43） | －0．31 | （0．30） | －0．28 | （0．32） | 0.40 | （0．24） |
| School autonomy for curriculum and assessment | －2．86 | （3．13） | －4．61 | （1．99） | －6．11 | （2．58） | －6．82 | （1．67） |
| $\times$ Percentage of students in schools that implement a standardised policy for mathematics （additional 10\％） | 0.47 | （0．49） | 0.69 | （0．30） | 0.86 | （0．40） | 0.96 | （0．27） |
| Private school |  |  | －0．14 | （1．72） |  |  | －0．65 | （1．33） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS） |  |  | 18.20 | （0．31） |  |  | 18.76 | （0．29） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS squared） |  |  | 3.13 | （0．22） |  |  | 4.25 | （0．16） |
| Student is a female |  |  | －13．61 | （0．56） |  |  | －11．05 | （0．40） |
| Student＇s language at home is the same as the language of assessment |  |  | 6.96 | （1．29） |  |  | 6.06 | （0．99） |
| Student without an immigrant background |  |  | 10.61 | （1．00） |  |  | 0.84 | （0．89） |
| School average PISA index of economic，social and cultural status |  |  | 65.24 | （1．05） |  |  | 60.10 | （0．88） |
| School in a city（100 000 or more people） |  |  | －5．85 | （1．15） |  |  | －4．26 | （0．84） |
| School in a small town or village（ $\mathbf{1 5 0 0 0}$ or less people） |  |  | 5.46 | （1．26） |  |  | 6.68 | （0．95） |
| School size（100 students） |  |  | 2.61 | （0．22） |  |  | 1.76 | （0．16） |
| School size（100 students，squared） |  |  | －0．05 | （0．01） |  |  | －0．02 | （0．00） |
| N | 256739 |  | 256739 |  | 420028 |  | 420028 |  |

Notes：Estimates significant at the $5 \%$ level（ $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ）are in bold and those significant at the $10 \%$ level（ $\mathrm{p}<0.10$ ）are in italics．Both net and gross models include country fixed effects，estimate no intercept，are run with using BRR weights to account for the sampling design．Each country contribute to the analysis with equal weights． StatLink 芴ist http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Table IV．1．15 School autonomy and performance，by system＇s extent of teachers participating in school management

|  | OECD countries （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  | All countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 （OLS regression estimates） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross model |  | Net model |  | Gross model |  | Net model |  |
|  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| School autonomy for resource allocation | 6.17 | （0．86） | －2．06 | （0．78） | 5.77 | （0．74） | －1．78 | （0．57） |
| $\times$ Index of school management：teacher participation（1 unit increase） | 20.60 | （2．43） | 4.36 | （1．86） | 14.76 | （2．04） | 4.32 | （1．14） |
| School autonomy for curriculum and assessment | －0．39 | （0．84） | －0．42 | （0．57） | －0．87 | （0．83） | －0．64 | （0．49） |
| $\times$ Index of school management：teacher participation（1 unit increase） | －5．05 | （3．43） | －0．63 | （2．44） | 8.46 | （2．60） | 6.69 | （1．51） |
| Private school |  |  | －0．22 | （1．73） |  |  | －1．55 | （1．36） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS） |  |  | 18.20 | （0．31） |  |  | 18.74 | （0．29） |
| PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of student（ESCS squared） |  |  | 3.13 | （0．22） |  |  | 4.23 | （0．16） |
| Student is a female |  |  | －13．58 | （0．56） |  |  | －11．01 | （0．40） |
| Student＇s language at home is the same as the language of assessment |  |  | 7.01 | （1．30） |  |  | 6.25 | （0．99） |
| Student without an immigrant background |  |  | 10.59 | （1．00） |  |  | 0.79 | （0．89） |
| School average PISA index of economic，social and cultural status |  |  | 65.03 | （1．05） |  |  | 59.62 | （0．88） |
| School in a city（100 000 or more people） |  |  | －5．84 | （1．14） |  |  | －4．15 | （0．83） |
| School in a small town or village（15000 or less people） |  |  | 5.38 | （1．26） |  |  | 6.64 | （0．95） |
| School size（100 students） |  |  | 2.61 | （0．23） |  |  | 1.79 | （0．16） |
| School size（100 students，squared） |  |  | －0．05 | （0．01） |  |  | －0．02 | （0．00） |
| N | 256739 |  | 256739 |  | 420028 |  | 420028 |  |

Notes：Estimates significant at the $5 \%$ level（ $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ）are in bold and those significant at the $10 \%$ level（ $\mathrm{p}<0.10$ ）are in italics．Both net and gross models include country fixed effects，estimate no intercept，are run with using BRR weights to account for the sampling design．Each country contribute to the analysis with equal weights
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Mathematics performance and school choice
Table IV．1．16 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | Mathematics performance，by school principals＇reports on the number of schools competing for students in the same area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Two or more other schools |  | One other school |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { other schools } \end{gathered}$ |  | Performance difference （one or more－none） |  | Performance difference （one or more－none） after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference （one or more－none） after accounting for student and school ESCS |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 506 | （1．7） | 474 | （5．8） | 509 | （13．8） | －5 | （14．2） | －11 | （12．3） | －17 | （10．4） |
|  | Austria | 518 | （5．5） | 499 | （8．9） | 496 | （6．3） | 16 | （8．7） | 9 | （7．3） | －1 | （6．8） |
|  | Belgium | 517 | （3．1） | 512 | （13．7） | 492 | （20．3） | 24 | （21．6） | 22 | （17．0） | 19 | （13．2） |
|  | Canada | 522 | （2．4） | 517 | （5．4） | 507 | （4．0） | 14 | （4．8） | 8 | （4．3） | 1 | （4．1） |
|  | Chile | 430 | （3．9） | 410 | （6．8） | 404 | （10．9） | 22 | （11．5） | 7 | （9．0） | －3 | （8．2） |
|  | Czech Republic | 510 | （4．4） | 481 | （10．1） | 459 | （11．3） | 47 | （12．2） | 37 | （10．6） | 21 | （10．2） |
|  | Denmark | 504 | （2．8） | 493 | （4．8） | 492 | （8．9） | 9 | （9．6） | 7 | （6．8） | 7 | （6．1） |
|  | Estonia | 526 | （2．8） | 512 | （5．1） | 512 | （3．9） | 11 | （4．6） | 7 | （4．4） | 4 | （4．6） |
|  | Finland | 523 | （3．0） | 513 | （3．6） | 518 | （3．3） | 1 | （4．2） | －3 | （3．6） | －8 | （3．0） |
|  | France | 511 | （6．4） | 497 | （11．5） | 477 | （6．6） | 29 | （10．1） | 16 | （8．2） | －3 | （7．2） |
|  | Germany | 529 | （4．8） | 503 | （9．0） | 474 | （13．6） | 48 | （14．9） | 40 | （12．4） | 13 | （8．0） |
|  | Greece | 467 | （3．9） | 466 | （7．5） | 425 | （5．3） | 41 | （6．4） | 25 | （5．3） | 5 | （4．9） |
|  | Hungary | 486 | （6．7） | 466 | （9．9） | 468 | （9．8） | 12 | （12．3） | 9 | （8．9） | 6 | （7．8） |
|  | Iceland | 492 | （2．6） | 507 | （4．1） | 489 | （2．2） | 8 | （2．9） | 1 | （3．1） | －5 | （3．1） |
|  | Ireland | 501 | （3．0） | 510 | （7．8） | 506 | （4．7） | －4 | （5．5） | －4 | （4．2） | －6 | （4．3） |
|  | Israel | 476 | （6．1） | 452 | （11．4） | 448 | （11．4） | 22 | （13．2） | 21 | （9．5） | 22 | （7．0） |
|  | Italy | 507 | （4．5） | 495 | （6．0） | 466 | （3．6） | 36 | （5．4） | 29 | （4．5） | 15 | （3．4） |
|  | Japan | 540 | （4．3） | 517 | （19．2） | 514 | （17．3） | 24 | （18．8） | 13 | （14．7） | －13 | （8．0） |
|  | Korea | 560 | （4．7） | 533 | （12．6） | 547 | （19．2） | 7 | （18．5） | 2 | （14．2） | －10 | （9．9） |
|  | Luxembourg | 486 | （1．1） | 543 | （3．2） | 474 | （2．0） | 21 | （2．2） | 9 | （2．5） | －8 | （2．3） |
|  | Mexico | 420 | （1．7） | 400 | （2．9） | 395 | （4．5） | 21 | （5．1） | 9 | （4．2） | －1 | （3．7） |
|  | Netherlands | 523 | （6．0） | 493 | （14．4） | 533 | （20．2） | －15 | （21．8） | －15 | （19．3） | －16 | （14．5） |
|  | New Zealand | 499 | （3．4） | 535 | （17．5） | 496 | （13．7） | 5 | （14．2） | －5 | （9．9） | －12 | （9．0） |
|  | Norway | 503 | （6．9） | 488 | （6．2） | 487 | （3．8） | 9 | （6．5） | 5 | （5．4） | 1 | （4．6） |
|  | Poland | 524 | （5．0） | 518 | （10．5） | 504 | （4．9） | 18 | （6．9） | 6 | （6．1） | －3 | （6．6） |
|  | Portugal | 499 | （5．1） | 478 | （8．5） | 466 | （8．5） | 27 | （9．3） | 13 | （7．2） | 3 | （7．4） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 493 | （4．2） | 446 | （15．3） | 448 | （11．2） | 39 | （12．2） | 13 | （9．6） | －12 | （9．6） |
|  | Slovenia | 519 | （1．8） | 477 | （3．3） | 478 | （2．2） | 33 | （2．8） | 25 | （2．8） | 8 | （3．3） |
|  | Spain | 492 | （2．3） | 465 | （4．8） | 472 | （4．3） | 15 | （5．0） | 3 | （4．2） | －5 | （4．4） |
|  | Sweden | 484 | （3．4） | 467 | （6．8） | 473 | （4．3） | 7 | （4．8） | 3 | （4．1） | －2 | （4．1） |
|  | Switzerland | 530 | （7．3） | 552 | （8．5） | 528 | （5．4） | 11 | （8．7） | 4 | （7．3） | －7 | （6．0） |
|  | Turkey | 460 | （6．1） | 410 | （8．6） | 425 | （9．4） | 29 | （10．6） | 16 | （9．7） | －9 | （9．2） |
|  | United Kingdom | 495 | （4．1） | 493 | （8．0） | 502 | （9．5） | －7 | （10．1） | －7 | （7．4） | －7 | （7．1） |
|  | United States | 484 | （4．6） | 462 | （18．7） | 482 | （6．2） | 0 | （7．8） | －2 | （6．8） | －4 | （6．6） |
|  | OECD average | 501 | （0．8） | 488 | （1．7） | 481 | （1．7） | 17 | （1．9） | 9 | （1．5） | －1 | （1．3） |


| $\sim$ Albania | 399 | （2．7） | 393 | （4．8） | 387 | （3．6） | 10 | （4．1） | c | c | c | c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cong$ Argentina | 397 | （3．8） | 367 | （10．7） | 353 | （7．3） | 40 | （8．2） | 21 | （7．9） | －6 | （8．3） |
| ๕ Brazil | 404 | （3．6） | 381 | （4．6） | 375 | （2．7） | 22 | （4．0） | 8 | （3．3） | －10 | （3．6） |
| Bulgaria | 446 | （5．3） | 413 | （9．0） | 417 | （17．7） | 24 | （19．3） | 8 | （13．6） | －6 | （10．8） |
| Colombia | 379 | （4．0） | 368 | （11．2） | 373 | （8．1） | 4 | （9．2） | －4 | （6．7） | －11 | （6．2） |
| Costa Rica | 412 | （4．1） | 397 | （9．6） | 398 | （5．8） | 11 | （7．4） | 5 | （5．4） | －1 | （4．5） |
| Croatia | 477 | （5．2） | 485 | （12．3） | 445 | （6．3） | 33 | （8．2） | 25 | （7．3） | 11 | （7．4） |
| Cyprus＊ | 460 | （1．8） | 434 | （3．1） | 423 | （1．9） | 29 | （2．6） | 15 | （2．6） | －7 | （2．8） |
| Hong Kong－China | 559 | （3．4） | 588 | （29．3） | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Indonesia | 379 | （4．5） | 360 | （6．4） | 335 | （26．2） | 41 | （26．5） | 28 | （28．9） | 13 | （31．9） |
| Jordan | 397 | （4．0） | 365 | （5．7） | 380 | （9．4） | 8 | （10．7） | 3 | （9．6） | －3 | （8．4） |
| Kazakhstan | 438 | （4．6） | 424 | （9．1） | 427 | （5．8） | 7 | （7．8） | －2 | （7．1） | －18 | （6．9） |
| Latvia | 491 | （2．9） | 491 | （8．0） | 484 | （11．0） | 8 | （11．3） | －8 | （7．3） | －21 | （6．4） |
| Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | 562 | （6．1） | －68 | （9．2） | －67 | （9．8） | －55 | （9．9） |
| Lithuania | 491 | （4．1） | 464 | （6．1） | 467 | （5．2） | 16 | （6．1） | 6 | （4．8） | －7 | （4．8） |
| Macao－China | 534 | （1．0） | 549 | （3．5） | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Malaysia | 426 | （4．4） | 413 | （8．4） | 410 | （8．0） | 12 | （9．3） | 5 | （7．6） | －4 | （7．2） |
| Montenegro | 399 | （2．4） | 438 | （2．7） | 403 | （1．3） | 14 | （2．4） | 11 | （2．4） | 2 | （2．4） |
| Peru | 382 | （4．3） | 366 | （10．4） | 320 | （7．1） | 59 | （8．1） | 30 | （6．2） | 3 | （6．3） |
| Qatar | 392 | （1．0） | 342 | （2．1） | 359 | （1．3） | 21 | （1．6） | 19 | （1．7） | 11 | （1．6） |
| Romania | 449 | （5．6） | 434 | （10．5） | 443 | （6．9） | 2 | （9．3） | －5 | （6．3） | －12 | （5．5） |
| Russian Federation | 491 | （3．8） | 474 | （5．9） | 468 | （7．8） | 19 | （7．7） | 6 | （6．8） | －5 | （6．7） |
| Serbia | 450 | （5．1） | 440 | （12．9） | 447 | （10．4） | 1 | （12．3） | 2 | （10．8） | 6 | （9．6） |
| Shanghai－China | 619 | （4．5） | 608 | （10．4） | 587 | （14．9） | 31 | （16．4） | 21 | （13．5） | 7 | （12．9） |
| Singapore | 569 | （1．4） | 646 | （4．3） | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Chinese Taipei | 566 | （3．8） | 523 | （9．8） | 549 | （46．1） | 11 | （46．8） | －4 | （35．5） | －25 | （18．3） |
| Thailand | 425 | （3．5） | 440 | （13．2） | 421 | （14．5） | 7 | （15．2） | 0 | （13．4） | －5 | （12．4） |
| Tunisia | 394 | （6．7） | 388 | （7．2） | 381 | （7．9） | 10 | （9．7） | 6 | （8．2） | 2 | （7．6） |
| United Arab Emirates | 437 | （3．0） | 427 | （7．1） | 424 | （10．1） | 12 | （10．4） | 3 | （7．7） | －9 | （4．9） |
| Uruguay | 428 | （5．7） | 402 | （9．3） | 394 | （5．2） | 27 | （7．9） | 12 | （5．8） | 0 | （5．1） |
| Viet Nam | 515 | （6．4） | 532 | （8．9） | 475 | （11．1） | 47 | （13．3） | 34 | （11．1） | 21 | （9．5） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of students．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 司页解 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Table IV.1.17 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Mathematics performance, by whether the school principal reported that achievement data of students in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds are used in the following ways: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Posted publicly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tracked over time by an administrative authority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | No |  | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  | No |  | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{array}$ | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 492 | (3.0) | 510 | (2.4) | 17 | (4.2) | 10 | (3.2) | 2 | (2.9) | 494 | (7.3) | 505 | (1.6) | 12 | (7.3) | 9 | (5.4) | 6 | (4.8) |
| U | Austria | 505 | (3.1) | 528 | (24.0) |  | (25.3) | 22 | (21.4) | 20 | (21.2) | 498 | (6.9) | 511 | (5.1) | 13 | (10.6) | 10 | (8.4) | 5 | (7.1) |
|  | Belgium | 515 | (2.3) | 522 | (30.5) | 7 | (31.3) | 5 | (24.9) | 0 | (20.4) | 502 | (4.6) | 529 | (4.3) | 27 | (7.8) | 22 | (5.8) | 14 | (4.7) |
|  | Canada | 517 | (2.5) | 519 | (2.7) | 2 | (3.8) | 2 | (3.4) | 2 | (3.4) | 529 | (5.3) | 517 | (2.0) | -12 | (5.8) | -9 | (4.8) | -6 | (5.0) |
|  | Chile | 418 | (5.8) | 425 | (4.0) | 7 | (7.7) | 4 | (5.5) | 2 | (5.0) | 403 | (9.5) | 426 | (3.4) | 23 | (10.6) | 9 | (7.7) | 0 | (7.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 487 | (4.8) | 513 | (5.4) | 27 | (7.5) | 17 | (6.1) | -2 | (5.5) | 496 | (5.3) | 502 | (4.5) | 6 | (7.0) | 4 | (6.0) | -1 | (6.1) |
|  | Denmark | 503 | (3.1) | 498 | (5.1) | -5 | (6.3) | -3 | (4.3) | -1 | (3.7) | 506 | (4.7) | 498 | (3.0) | -8 | (5.6) | -4 | (4.0) | -1 | (3.8) |
|  | Estonia | 520 | (2.8) | 522 | (3.6) | 3 | (4.9) | -1 | (4.4) | -4 | (4.3) | 525 | (5.6) | 519 | (2.3) | -6 | (6.2) | -5 | (5.4) | -3 | (5.1) |
|  | Finland | 518 | (2.0) | 530 | (10.4) | 12 | (10.7) | 12 | (11.4) | 12 | (12.4) | 520 | (2.8) | 517 | (2.8) | -3 | (4.1) | -5 | (3.7) | -7 | (3.6) |
|  | France | 482 | (5.7) | 514 | (5.5) | 32 | (9.9) | 22 | (7.5) | 11 | (6.3) | 513 | (9.1) | 490 | (4.4) | -22 | (12.1) | -12 | (8.6) | 2 | (6.2) |
|  | Germany | 515 | (4.0) | 512 | (14.7) | -2 | (16.4) | -8 | (12.2) | -7 | (8.1) | 511 | (5.5) | 520 | (6.1) | 8 | (9.6) | 10 | (7.4) | 12 | (5.3) |
|  | Greece | 451 | (3.0) | 456 | (6.0) | 5 | (7.0) | 1 | (5.6) | -4 | (5.4) | 451 | (5.3) | 454 | (4.6) | 4 | (8.5) | 4 | (6.4) | 4 | (5.4) |
|  | Hungary | 460 | (5.9) | 497 | (6.6) | 37 | (10.6) | 25 | (7.4) | 10 | (5.3) | 467 | (7.7) | 486 | (5.8) | 19 | (11.8) | 11 | (8.6) | 1 | (6.6) |
|  | Iceland | 492 | (2.0) | 496 | (3.0) | 4 | (3.4) | 2 | (3.4) | -1 | (3.4) | 502 | (3.4) | 491 | (2.0) | -11 | (3.8) | -11 | (3.7) | -11 | (3.7) |
|  | Ireland | 499 | (2.8) | 514 | (7.0) | 15 | (7.8) | 9 | (5.7) | 3 | (4.9) | 508 | (3.4) | 496 | (4.6) | -12 | (6.3) | -7 | (4.4) | -2 | (3.4) |
|  | Israel | 445 | (7.5) | 490 | (6.3) | 45 | (11.0) | 31 | (9.0) | 12 | (8.1) | 474 | (16.4) | 465 | (4.6) | -9 | (16.0) | -11 | (13.8) | -14 | (14.7) |
|  | Italy | 478 | (3.1) | 501 | (4.4) | 23 | (5.8) | 17 | (5.1) | 7 | (4.4) | 487 | (3.1) | 487 | (5.4) | 0 | (7.0) | -1 | (5.9) | -3 | (4.7) |
|  | Japan | 535 | (3.8) | 553 | (18.6) | 18 | (19.7) | 15 | (15.1) | 0 | (11.6) | 538 | (4.0) | 511 | (20.1) | -28 | (21.4) | -17 | (17.6) | 9 | (12.8) |
|  | Korea | 542 | (11.5) | 558 | (5.2) | 16 | (13.3) | 14 | (11.4) | 11 | (9.1) | 580 | (21.4) | 551 | (4.5) | -30 | (22.3) | -25 | (17.5) | -15 | (12.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 483 | (1.3) | 532 | (2.2) | 50 | (2.6) | 31 | (2.9) | 5 | (2.9) | 495 | (1.9) | 487 | (1.2) | -8 | (2.1) | -4 | (2.3) | 3 | (2.1) |
|  | Mexico | 413 | (2.0) | 413 | (2.3) | 0 | (3.3) | 1 | (2.7) | 2 | (2.5) | 400 | (5.8) | 414 | (1.4) | 15 | (6.1) | 7 | (4.8) | 1 | (4.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 508 | (21.9) | 521 | (4.9) | 12 | (23.8) | 7 | (19.4) | -5 | (13.6) | 523 | (11.6) | 519 | (5.5) | -5 | (14.3) | -7 | (12.2) | -9 | (9.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 500 | (9.4) | 502 | (3.4) | 2 | (11.3) | 4 | (7.1) | 6 | (5.1) | 517 | (14.7) | 501 | (2.8) | -16 | (15.8) | -17 | (6.8) | -17 | (11.4) |
|  | Norway | 483 | (4.1) | 497 | (3.8) | 14 | (5.8) | 9 | (4.8) | 4 | (4.5) | 491 | (8.3) | 490 | (2.7) | -1 | (8.5) | -4 | (8.0) | -8 | (7.7) |
|  | Poland | 509 | (3.7) | 527 | (6.8) | 18 | (7.8) | 14 | (6.0) | 11 | (5.3) | 513 | (6.0) | 519 | (4.4) | 6 | (7.5) | 8 | (5.8) | 9 | (5.3) |
|  | Portugal | 481 | (6.7) | 492 | (5.0) | 11 | (8.8) | 11 | (5.7) | 12 | (5.2) | 502 | (12.7) | 485 | (4.1) | -18 | (13.8) | -7 | (10.1) | 0 | (10.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 476 | (10.1) | 483 | (4.4) | 8 | (12.3) | 1 | (8.0) | -5 | (5.5) | 489 | (13.5) | 480 | (4.8) | -9 | (16.4) | -5 | (10.5) | -3 | (6.8) |
|  | Slovenia | 512 | (2.4) | 495 | (1.9) | -17 | (3.4) | -11 | (3.2) | 1 | (2.7) | 507 | (2.9) | 501 | (1.5) | -6 | (3.5) | -4 | (3.3) | 0 | (2.9) |
|  | Spain | 484 | (2.1) | 486 | (6.3) | 2 | (6.8) | -1 | (4.7) | -3 | (4.3) | 486 | (4.3) | 484 | (2.2) | -2 | (4.9) | 2 | (4.0) | 4 | (4.1) |
|  | Sweden | 478 | (6.3) | 479 | (2.5) | 1 | (6.9) | -1 | (5.7) | -2 | (5.5) | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Switzerland | 530 | (3.5) | 571 | (12.2) | 42 | (13.3) | 43 | (11.9) | 46 | (13.4) | 518 | (5.6) | 544 | (5.6) | 26 | (8.9) | 24 | (7.7) | 21 | (6.7) |
|  | Turkey | 423 | (6.0) | 461 | (6.2) | 38 | (8.4) | 27 | (7.2) | 6 | (7.7) | 431 | (21.2) | 449 | (5.0) | 18 | (22.0) | 14 | (18.9) | 5 | (18.4) |
|  | United Kingdom | 492 | (11.1) | 496 | (3.6) | 4 | (11.5) | 0 | (8.8) | -5 | (7.0) | 524 | (19.3) | 492 | (4.0) | -32 | (20.5) | -22 | (14.6) | -8 | (8.8) |
|  | United States | 475 | (13.5) | 483 | (4.0) | 9 | (14.5) | 14 | (12.4) | 19 | (12.0) | 524 | (12.4) | 481 | (3.8) | -43 | (13.1) | -17 | (11.8) | 4 | (11.4) |
|  | OECD average | 489 | (1.2) | 503 | (1.6) | 14 | (2.1) | 10 | (1.7) | 5 | (1.5) | 498 | (1.7) | 494 | (0.9) | -4 | (2.0) | -2 | (1.6) | -1 | (1.4) |
|  | Albania | 394 | (2.4) | 395 | (3.9) | 1 | (4.6) | c | c | c | c | 407 | (5.0) | 392 | (2.2) | -14 | (5.4) | c | c | c | c |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 388 | (3.9) | 386 | (10.4) | -2 | (11.4) | -1 | (8.7) | 1 | (7.5) | 399 | (7.6) | 385 | (4.1) | -14 | (8.9) | -8 | (7.0) | -1 | (5.6) |
| - | Brazil | 394 | (3.6) | 390 | (3.5) | -4 | (5.7) | -2 | (4.2) | -1 | (3.4) | 399 | (8.9) | 391 | (2.4) | -8 | (9.9) | -7 | (6.9) | -7 | (5.7) |
|  | Bulgaria | 407 | (5.9) | 465 | (5.9) | 59 | (8.8) | 41 | (6.9) | 23 | (6.1) | 426 | (20.4) | 440 | (4.0) | 14 | (20.8) | 13 | (14.1) | 11 | (10.2) |
|  | Colombia | 371 | (4.7) | 382 | (4.4) | 12 | (7.0) | 9 | (5.1) | 7 | (4.4) | 382 | (6.2) | 376 | (3.1) | -6 | (7.0) | -4 | (5.8) | -2 | (6.3) |
|  | Costa Rica | 406 | (3.3) | 420 | (7.1) | 14 | (7.7) | 9 | (6.0) | 5 | (6.5) | 425 | (26.5) | 406 | (2.9) | -18 | (26.4) | -15 | (19.8) | -11 | (17.2) |
|  | Croatia | 473 | (5.1) | 465 | (8.5) | -8 | (11.5) | -6 | (9.1) | -3 | (6.6) | 476 | (14.8) | 470 | (3.7) | -5 | (15.8) | -6 | (13.2) | -8 | (10.4) |
|  | Cyprus* | 433 | (1.3) | 469 | (2.8) | 36 | (3.2) | 18 | (3.2) | -10 | (3.4) | 426 | (2.3) | 442 | (1.3) | 16 | (2.7) | 14 | (2.7) | 12 | (2.7) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 552 | (5.2) | 580 | (8.5) | 28 | (11.7) | 28 | (10.1) | 26 | (9.1) | 564 | (9.1) | 560 | (5.2) | -4 | (12.6) | 0 | (10.5) | 5 | (9.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 372 | (4.9) | 388 | (9.4) | 17 | (11.0) | 10 | (9.5) | 2 | (8.4) | 369 | (8.5) | 379 | (5.0) | 10 | (10.3) | 10 | (8.6) | 9 | (7.3) |
|  | Jordan | 388 | (3.3) | 377 | (11.8) | -11 | (13.0) | -11 | (11.6) | -14 | (9.8) | 372 | (8.5) | 388 | (3.4) | 16 | (9.0) | 13 | (8.2) | 9 | (8.8) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 428 | (6.8) | 433 | (3.5) | 4 | (8.0) | 1 | (7.5) | -2 | (7.4) | c | c | 432 | (3.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Latvia | 486 | (3.6) | 499 | (4.6) | 13 | (6.0) | 10 | (4.9) | 8 | (4.6) | 490 | (5.3) | 490 | (3.0) | 0 | (6.2) | -2 | (5.1) | -4 | (4.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 491 | (4.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | - | 484 | (5.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 477 | (3.3) | 483 | (4.3) | 6 | (5.5) | 7 | (4.2) | 9 | (3.8) | 478 | (7.0) | 479 | (3.1) | 1 | (8.2) | 0 | (6.3) | -1 | (5.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 536 | (1.1) | 564 | (3.8) | 28 | (4.1) | 26 | (4.0) | 23 | (4.0) | 537 | (1.4) | 537 | (1.3) | 0 | (1.8) | 1 | (1.7) | 1 | (1.7) |
|  | Malaysia | 418 | (4.4) | 426 | (5.2) | 9 | (7.2) | 7 | (5.3) | 5 | (4.5) | 404 | (9.1) | 421 | (3.4) | 17 | (10.4) | 6 | (6.0) | -6 | (10.1) |
|  | Montenegro | 393 | (2.0) | 414 | (1.3) | 21 | (2.6) | 18 | (2.8) | 9 | (2.7) | c | c | 410 | (1.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Peru | 369 | (3.8) | 366 | (12.8) | -3 | (13.1) | -6 | (8.7) | -8 | (7.2) | 360 | (5.7) | 373 | (5.3) | 12 | (8.3) | 6 | (5.1) | 1 | (4.1) |
|  | Qatar | 367 | (1.1) | 386 | (1.0) | 19 | (1.3) | 18 | (1.5) | 15 | (1.4) | 442 | (4.6) | 374 | (0.8) | -68 | (4.7) | -63 | (4.5) | -54 | (4.4) |
|  | Romania | 438 | (7.4) | 448 | (4.5) | 10 | (8.9) | 9 | (6.7) | 9 | (5.8) | 444 | (8.9) | 445 | (4.3) | 1 | (10.3) | 1 | (8.0) | 1 | (7.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 471 | (5.8) | 485 | (3.8) | 14 | (7.4) | 6 | (5.7) | 0 | (5.2) | c |  | 482 | (3.0) | c | c | c | c | c | C |
|  | Serbia | 444 | (6.1) | 452 | (6.7) | 8 | (10.3) | 6 | (8.4) | 1 | (6.0) | 455 | (7.3) | 443 | (5.9) | -12 | (10.7) | -9 | (8.9) | -3 | (6.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 613 | (3.3) | 600 | (26.2) | -13 | (26.4) | -12 | (22.9) | -11 | (20.2) | 607 | (8.4) | 616 | (6.2) | 10 | (12.9) | 5 | (9.9) | -1 | (7.2) |
|  | Singapore | 560 | (1.6) | 588 | (1.9) | 28 | (2.5) | 20 | (2.5) | 7 | (3.4) | c | c | 575 | (1.3) | c | c | c |  | c | C |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 559 | (4.2) | 564 | (16.6) | 5 | (18.9) | 2 | (12.7) | -1 | (9.1) | 562 | (6.1) | 557 | (6.7) | -5 | (10.9) | 0 | (8.2) | 7 | (6.5) |
|  | Thailand | 411 | (7.6) | 432 | (4.2) | 21 | (9.2) | 17 | (7.8) | 14 | (7.3) | 394 | (20.7) | 427 | (3.5) | 33 | (21.1) | 37 | (18.4) | 40 | (18.4) |
|  | Tunisia | 389 | (4.6) | 379 | (8.8) | -10 | (10.0) | -7 | (9.0) | -3 | (9.6) | 400 | (8.6) | 384 | (4.8) | -16 | (10.4) | -13 | (8.6) | -8 | (7.2) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 433 | (3.7) | 437 | (3.4) | 4 | (5.2) | 4 | (4.9) | 5 | (5.2) | 445 | (10.2) | 434 | (2.8) | -11 | (11.3) | -9 | (10.1) | -6 | (9.3) |
|  | Uruguay | 409 | (3.2) | 411 | (9.8) |  | (11.1) | 6 | (9.5) | 9 | (8.9) | 418 | (8.6) | 406 | (3.2) | -12 | (10.1) | -5 | (6.7) | 0 | (5.6) |
|  | Viet Nam | 487 | (9.6) | 519 | (5.0) | 33 | (10.7) | 28 | (9.3) | 24 | (9.0) | 501 | (8.2) | 512 | (6.0) | 11 | (10.4) | 8 | (8.5) | 6 | (9.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students.
See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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| $\cdots$ | Albania | 398 (7.0) | 394 | (2.1) | -5 | (7.5) | c | c | c | C | 404 | (13.0) | 394 | (2.1) | -10 | (13.4) | c | c | c | c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 390 (12.9) | 389 | (3.9) | 0 | (14.3) | 5 | (10.2) | 10 | (7.0) | 395 | (6.3) | 387 | (4.1) | -9 | (7.6) | -9 | (5.7) | -10 | (5.6) |
| ก | Brazil | 407 (19.6) | 390 | (2.1) | -17 | (20.1) | -12 | (15.2) | -5 | (10.6) | 387 | (4.3) | 393 | (3.1) | 6 | (6.0) | 1 | (4.4) | -4 | (3.8) |
|  | Bulgaria | 428 (14.7) | 441 | (4.4) | 13 | (16.1) | 0 | (11.8) | -12 | (9.5) | 430 | (13.4) | 442 | (4.6) | 12 | (15.2) | 10 | (10.8) | 8 | (7.2) |
|  | Colombia | 368 (18.3) | 377 | (3.0) | 8 | (18.7) | 11 | (14.8) | 14 | (13.2) | 365 | (17.0) | 377 | (3.0) | 12 | (17.5) | 9 | (15.4) | 7 | (14.9) |
|  | Costa Rica | 405 (7.4) | 408 | (3.4) | 2 | (8.0) | -1 | (6.9) | -4 | (6.8) | 393 | (5.2) | 410 | (3.5) | 17 | (6.1) | 11 | (5.0) | 5 | (5.3) |
|  | Croatia | 483 (22.6) | 471 | (4.0) | -12 | (24.1) | -11 | (19.0) | -6 | (12.6) | 475 | (9.8) | 470 | (4.7) | -5 | (12.3) | -2 | (9.8) | 3 | (7.4) |
|  | Cyprus* | C C | 439 | (1.1) | C | c | c | c | c | c | 430 | (2.4) | 441 | (1.3) | 11 | (2.8) | 6 | (2.7) | -3 | (2.7) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | C | 561 | (3.3) | c | c | C | c | c | c | 551 | (15.0) | 562 | (3.7) | 12 | (16.5) | 6 | (14.6) | -3 | (12.4) |
|  | Indonesia | c c | 376 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 345 | (12.9) | 378 | (4.4) | 33 | (14.0) | 28 | (11.3) | 22 | (9.4) |
|  | Jordan | 381 (13.1) | 387 | (3.2) | 6 | (13.5) | 4 | (12.7) | 0 | (12.8) | 362 | (9.0) | 388 | (3.3) | 25 | (9.6) | 19 | (8.8) | 10 | (9.9) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 403 (12.5) | 433 | (3.1) | 29 | (13.2) | 21 | (10.3) | 11 | (8.5) | C | c | 432 | (3.0) | c | C | c | c | c | C |
|  | Latvia | 467 (14.7) | 490 | (2.8) | 22 | (14.6) | 17 | (11.8) | 15 | (11.0) | 471 | (8.7) | 490 | (2.9) | 20 | (9.3) | 12 | (6.8) | 7 | (5.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c c | 557 | (4.1) | C | c | c | C | C | c | C | c | 490 | (4.7) | c | C | c | c | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 466 (7.7) | 484 | (3.3) | 18 | (9.1) | 12 | (7.1) | 4 | (5.6) | 474 | (7.0) | 480 | (3.4) | 6 | (8.4) | 6 | (6.7) | 6 | (5.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 502 (3.2) | 542 | (1.0) | 40 | (3.4) | 38 | (3.6) | 34 | (3.5) | 459 | (4.1) | 544 | (1.0) | 85 | (4.3) | 82 | (4.3) | 77 | (4.3) |
|  | Malaysia | c c | 420 | (3.2) | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 421 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Montenegro | 392 (3.4) | 411 | (1.1) | 19 | (3.7) | 12 | (3.7) | -6 | (3.8) | 419 | (2.1) | 408 | (1.3) | -11 | (2.6) | -7 | (2.5) | 3 | (2.6) |
|  | Peru | 341 (8.9) | 371 | (4.1) | 30 | (10.0) | 18 | (6.7) | 9 | (5.8) | 358 | (5.4) | 373 | (5.0) | 14 | (7.5) | 10 | (4.9) | 7 | (4.0) |
|  | Qatar | C C | 375 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | 375 | (0.8) | c | C | c | c | c | C |
|  | Romania | 436 (12.6) | 446 | (3.9) | 10 | (13.3) | 11 | (9.4) | 12 | (7.7) | 445 | (13.0) | 444 | (4.1) | -1 | (14.2) | -2 | (11.2) | -3 | (9.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 462 (12.1) | 484 | (2.9) | 21 | (11.9) | 11 | (11.7) | 3 | (11.7) | 493 | (10.1) | 481 | (3.3) | -12 | (11.1) | -7 | (9.3) | -3 | (8.2) |
|  | Serbia | 465 (13.2) | 447 | (5.0) | -18 | (15.3) | -13 | (13.0) | -5 | (10.4) | 444 | (5.6) | 455 | (6.7) | 11 | (9.7) | 7 | (7.9) | -5 | (6.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | C | 613 | (3.3) | c | C | C | C | C | c | 583 | (12.8) | 617 | (3.5) | 34 | (13.5) | 18 | (9.4) | -6 | (7.7) |
|  | Singapore | c c | 575 | (1.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | 575 | (1.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 561 (18.8) | 559 | (3.9) | -3 | (19.9) | 0 | (13.4) | 5 | (9.0) | 568 | (14.5) | 558 | (4.5) | -11 | (16.9) | -5 | (13.5) | 3 | (11.4) |
|  | Thailand | 391 (6.0) | 428 | (3.6) | 36 | (7.1) | 26 | (5.8) | 16 | (7.4) | 397 | (15.6) | 429 | (3.6) | 32 | (15.9) | 23 | (13.4) | 15 | (11.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 392 (5.9) | 385 | (6.4) | -7 | (9.2) | -3 | (8.0) | 1 | (7.3) | 385 | (5.4) | 397 | (8.8) | 12 | (11.1) | 10 | (9.3) | 8 | (8.2) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 397 (11.0) | 436 | (2.1) | 39 | (11.1) | 29 | (9.9) | 16 | (10.0) | 465 | (11.5) | 434 | (2.3) | -31 | (12.0) | -24 | (12.8) | -13 | (14.8) |
|  | Uruguay | 409 (8.3) | 410 | (4.2) | 1 | (11.0) | -3 | (7.1) | -5 | (5.9) | 410 | (5.6) | 408 | (5.6) | -2 | (9.9) | 3 | (6.2) | 7 | (4.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | c c | 511 | (4.9) | c | C | C | C | c | c | 487 | (19.1) | 513 | (4.9) | 26 | (19.5) | 20 | (16.6) | 15 | (14.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students.
See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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[Part 2/5]
Mathematics performance and quality assurance and school improvement
Mesults based on school principals' reports
Mathematics performance, by whether the school principal reported that the
at quality assurance and improvement:
Systematic recording of data, including teacher

|  |  | Mathematics performance, by whether the school principal reported that the school has the following measures aimed at quality assurance and improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Systematic recording of data, including teacher and student attendance and graduation rates, test results and professional development of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Internal evaluation/self-evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | No | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance <br> difference <br> (yes - no) <br> after <br> accounting <br> for student <br> ESCS and <br> school <br> average ESCS |  | No |  | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  |
|  |  | Mean <br> score$\quad$ S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 492 (15.2) | 504 | (1.7) |  | (15.3) |  | (11.2) | -2 | (8.2) | 519 | (7.9) | 503 | (1.7) | -16 | (8.4) | -12 | (7.5) | -10 | (7.6) |
| U | Austria | 507 (9.9) | 507 | (4.0) |  | (12.3) | 0 | (9.8) | -1 | (8.3) | 524 | (13.1) | 504 | (3.8) | -20 | (15.2) | -14 | (11.4) | -6 | (10.0) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 482 (7.2) | 525 | (3.2) | 43 | (8.9) | 32 | (6.8) | 16 | (5.6) | 492 | (9.0) | 522 | (3.5) | 30 | (11.4) | 21 | (8.5) | 8 | (5.3) |
|  | Canada | 520 (7.9) | 518 | (2.2) |  | (8.7) | -4 | (7.1) | -6 | (6.3) | 520 | (4.5) | 518 | (2.4) | -2 | (5.6) | -6 | (5.0) | -10 | (4.8) |
|  | Chile | 423 (9.9) | 423 | (3.3) | -1 | (10.6) | 6 | (7.1) | 9 | (6.7) | 404 | (10.2) | 425 | (3.2) | 21 | (10.5) | 13 | (7.2) | 7 | (7.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 480 (13.9) | 503 | (3.5) |  | (14.6) |  | (11.8) | 7 | (8.5) | 555 | (19.5) | 499 | (3.7) | -56 | (20.6) | -45 | (12.2) | -26 | (9.3) |
|  | Denmark | 501 (8.6) | 500 | (2.6) | -1 | (9.1) | -2 | (6.0) | -3 | (5.0) | 502 | (7.5) | 500 | (2.8) | -2 | (8.1) | 4 | (5.4) | 8 | (4.6) |
|  | Estonia | 533 (15.0) | 520 | (2.1) |  | (15.5) | -12 | (13.1) |  | (11.1) | c | c | 520 | (2.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Finland | 522 (2.7) | 517 | (2.5) | -5 | (3.6) | -4 | (3.2) | -3 | (3.2) | 511 | (10.8) | 519 | (2.0) | 8 | (11.1) | 10 | (9.5) | 11 | (8.7) |
|  | France | 518 (9.8) | 488 | (4.2) |  | (12.1) | -20 | (8.7) | -8 | (6.8) | 502 | (7.0) | 492 | (5.8) | -10 | (11.2) | -8 | (7.8) | -6 | (5.6) |
|  | Germany | 521 (11.0) | 512 | (4.3) |  | (13.1) | -5 | (9.9) | 4 | (6.9) | 498 | (8.9) | 520 | (4.7) | 22 | (11.7) | 14 | (9.9) | 6 | (8.4) |
|  | Greece | 448 (5.1) | 455 | (3.6) | 6 | (7.0) |  | (5.3) | -1 | (4.8) | 454 | (3.7) | 450 | (7.0) | -3 | (9.4) | -2 | (6.7) | -1 | (5.6) |
|  | Hungary | 466 (15.7) | 480 | (4.0) |  | (17.8) |  | (12.8) | 2 | (9.1) | 509 | (23.8) | 476 | (3.6) | -32 | (24.5) | -16 | (17.1) | 2 | (16.0) |
|  | Iceland | 461 (6.8) | 496 | (1.9) |  | (7.3) |  | (7.4) | 14 | (7.6) | c | c | 494 | (1.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 508 (10.3) | 501 | (2.7) |  | (11.0) | -4 | (7.8) | -3 | (5.8) | 506 | (7.0) | 501 | (3.0) | -5 | (8.0) | -3 | (5.8) | 0 | (5.2) |
|  | Israel | 485 (21.0) | 465 | (5.0) | -20 | (22.2) | -14 | (17.0) | -9 | (13.0) | 462 | (13.9) | 467 | (5.0) | 5 | (15.0) | 1 | (12.4) | 1 | (10.0) |
|  | Italy | 488 (3.6) | 488 | (3.6) | 0 | (5.6) |  | (4.7) | 0 | (4.1) | 488 | (5.7) | 487 | (2.6) | -1 | (6.5) | 0 | (5.6) | 2 | (4.9) |
|  | Japan | 530 (6.0) | 542 | (5.3) | 12 | (8.7) |  | (7.4) | 7 | (6.2) | 488 | (15.2) | 538 | (3.6) | 50 | (16.3) | 44 | (13.3) | 29 | (14.7) |
|  | Korea | 546 (13.9) | 554 | (4.9) |  | (15.2) |  | (12.4) | 1 | (8.9) | c | c | 553 | (4.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Luxembourg | 463 (1.8) | 503 | (1.4) | 40 | (2.1) | 21 | (2.3) | -7 | (2.3) | 500 | (2.2) | 490 | (1.4) | -10 | (2.3) | -10 | (2.5) | -12 | (2.3) |
|  | Mexico | 407 (6.3) | 414 | (1.4) | 7 | (6.5) |  | (5.1) | 6 | (4.6) | 407 | (5.8) | 414 | (1.5) | 6 | (6.1) | 5 | (5.3) | 4 | (4.9) |
|  | Netherlands | c c | 521 | (4.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 526 | (20.5) | 519 | (4.8) | -7 | (21.9) | -3 | (18.8) | 7 | (14.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 465 (33.3) | 503 | (2.6) | 37 | (34.0) |  | (20.4) | 18 | (12.1) | c | c | 502 | (2.5) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Norway | 492 (6.7) | 490 | (3.1) | -2 | (7.5) |  | (6.2) | 0 | (5.7) | 484 | (4.7) | 494 | (3.6) | 10 | (6.0) | 6 | (5.4) | 3 | (5.0) |
|  | Poland | c c | 517 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 518 | (16.3) | 517 | (3.7) | -1 | (16.6) | -1 | (14.6) | -1 | (15.0) |
|  | Portugal | 524 (16.3) | 485 | (4.0) |  | (17.2) | -20 | (7.7) | -8 | (7.0) | c | c | 487 | (3.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Slovak Republic | 479 (18.7) | 481 | (3.7) | 2 | (19.9) | 0 | (14.1) | -2 | (10.0) | 428 | (21.6) | 484 | (3.6) | 56 | (22.5) | 38 | (15.6) | 22 | (11.3) |
|  | Slovenia | 504 (3.5) | 503 | (1.5) | -1 | (3.9) | -2 | (3.8) | -1 | (3.3) | 521 | (8.9) | 502 | (1.4) | -20 | (9.2) | -15 | (6.8) | -7 | (5.1) |
|  | Spain | 491 (4.9) | 484 | (2.0) | -7 | (5.2) | -10 | (4.7) | -12 | (5.2) | 486 | (3.3) | 484 | (2.1) | -2 | (3.7) | -2 | (3.7) | -2 | (4.3) |
|  | Sweden | 474 (9.8) | 479 | (2.4) |  | (10.1) |  | (8.2) | 14 | (7.4) | 463 | (9.0) | 480 | (2.5) | 17 | (9.9) | 8 | (6.6) | 1 | (6.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 521 (5.8) | 540 | (5.6) |  | (9.4) | 17 | (7.8) | 14 | (6.5) | 525 | (9.4) | 534 | (3.7) | 9 | (10.4) | 11 | (8.5) | 14 | (7.6) |
|  | Turkey | 456 (52.0) | 448 | (4.3) |  | (51.2) |  | (45.1) |  | (36.8) | c | c | 449 | (4.9) | c | c | c | (8.5) | c | c |
|  | United Kingdom | 469 (16.9) | 495 | (3.6) |  | (17.1) |  | (15.1) | , | (13.3) | c | c | 495 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | United States | c c | 482 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 472 | (17.7) | 483 | (3.8) | 11 | (18.5) | 3 | (14.8) | -2 | (12.7) |
|  | OECD average | 489 (2.8) | 495 | (0.6) | 5 | (2.9) | 3 | (2.3) | 2 | (1.8) | 491 | (2.3) | 495 | (0.6) | 2 | (2.5) | 2 | (1.9) | 2 | (1.7) |
|  | Albania | 389 (9.6) | 394 | (2.2) | 5 | (10.2) | c | c | c | c | 397 | (12.5) | 394 | (2.0) | -3 | (12.7) | c | , | c | C |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 385 (8.4) | 391 | (4.3) | 5 | (10.2) | 3 | (8.1) | -1 | (7.5) | 380 | (7.6) | 391 | (3.9) | 11 | (9.1) | 7 | (7.1) | 0 | (7.9) |
| む | Brazil | 382 (5.1) | 393 | (2.9) | 11 | (6.7) | 6 | (4.8) | 1 | (3.7) | 374 | (6.1) | 392 | (2.3) | 18 | (6.5) | 8 | (5.3) | -3 | (5.4) |
|  | Bulgaria | c c | 440 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 439 | (3.9) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Colombia | 378 (10.1) | 377 | (3.3) | -1 | (11.2) |  | (9.2) | 3 | (8.7) | 309 | (13.7) | 378 | (2.9) | 70 | (14.0) | 58 | (7.2) | 48 | (11.9) |
|  | Costa Rica | 396 (5.4) | 409 | (3.3) |  | (5.8) |  | (4.8) | 1 | (6.1) | 413 | (10.4) | 406 | (3.2) | -7 | (11.1) | -10 | (8.9) | -12 | (7.8) |
|  | Croatia | 458 (20.5) | 472 | (3.8) |  | (21.6) |  | (18.2) | 2 | (13.0) | 470 | (19.2) | 471 | (4.0) | 1 | (20.6) | 7 | (17.2) | 18 | (11.8) |
|  | Cyprus* | 424 (4.7) | 440 | (1.2) | 16 | (4.9) | 13 | (4.6) | 8 | (4.5) | 434 | (2.3) | 440 | (1.2) | 6 | (2.6) | 2 | (2.5) | -4 | (2.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | c | 561 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 561 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Indonesia | c c | 375 | (4.1) | c | c | C | c | c | c | 371 | (8.9) | 376 | (4.5) | 5 | (10.5) | 0 | (8.9) | -6 | (8.1) |
|  | Jordan | 389 (10.6) | 385 | (3.1) | -4 | (10.6) | -3 | (9.4) | -2 | (8.7) | 362 | (7.4) | 388 | (3.4) | 26 | (8.4) | 25 | (8.3) | 22 | (9.5) |
|  | Kazakhstan | c c | 432 | (3.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 432 | (3.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Latvia | c c | 490 | (2.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 488 | (2.7) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | 557 (5.2) | 497 | (5.8) | -60 | (7.8) | -57 | (8.5) | -50 | (8.5) | c | c | 532 | (3.9) | c | c | C | c | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | - | 479 | (2.7) | c | c | c | c | , | ) | 484 | (17.6) | 479 | (2.9) | -6 | (18.6) | -6 | (15.6) | -7 | (13.6) |
|  | Macao-China | c | 539 | (1.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 511 | (2.9) | 542 | (1.0) | 31 | (3.0) | 28 | (3.1) | 22 | (3.1) |
|  | Malaysia | c c | 420 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 420 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Montenegro | c c | 409 | (1.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 410 | (1.1) | c | c |  | c | c | C |
|  | Peru | 363 (5.1) | 370 | (5.6) | 7 | (8.4) | 4 | (5.1) | 2 | (3.9) | 363 | (7.2) | 368 | (4.2) | 5 | (8.8) | 3 | (5.9) | 2 | (5.3) |
|  | Qatar | c c | 375 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 375 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Romania | 425 (11.4) | 447 | (3.9) | 22 | (12.2) | 17 | (9.5) | 14 | (8.8) | 458 | (13.3) | 443 | (4.0) | -16 | (14.2) | -10 | (11.1) | -6 | (9.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 457 (29.1) | 483 | (3.1) |  | (29.5) | 17 | (23.3) | 9 | (20.2) | 426 | (15.8) | 483 | (3.1) | 57 | (16.5) | 39 | (16.3) | 25 | (18.1) |
|  | Serbia | 480 (23.0) | 450 | (4.2) | -30 | (23.8) | -28 | (19.2) | -28 | (19.3) | 417 | (15.1) | 450 | (4.0) | 33 | (15.5) | 22 | (13.8) | -4 | (12.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | C C | 614 | (3.2) | C | c | C | c | C | c | c | c | 613 | (3.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Singapore | c c | 574 | (1.3) | c | c | c | c | c |  | c | c | 574 | (1.3) | c | c | c | c | C | c |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 555 (14.2) | 559 | (3.8) | 4 | (15.1) | 13 | (10.3) | 27 | (11.8) | 544 | (10.4) | 562 | (4.7) | 18 | (13.0) | 9 | (10.4) | -4 | (9.9) |
|  | Thailand | c c | 428 | (3.4) | c | c | c | c | c | c | , | c | 427 | (3.4) | c | c |  | c | c | c |
|  | Tunisia | 372 (7.3) | 395 | (5.0) | 23 | (9.7) | 21 | (7.8) | 17 | (6.9) | 392 | (17.4) | 388 | (4.2) | -4 | (18.1) | -2 | (15.7) | 2 | (14.5) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 454 (19.8) | 435 | (2.5) | -19 | (20.5) |  | (15.9) | 17 | (18.5) | 410 | (16.1) | 435 | (2.5) | 25 | (16.4) | 21 | (13.3) | 19 | (11.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 436 (19.6) | 408 | (3.0) | -28 | (20.5) | -18 | (11.9) | -10 | (12.3) | 404 | (7.9) | 411 | (3.6) | 7 | (10.0) | 6 | (7.2) | 5 | (6.1) |
|  | Viet Nam | c c | 512 | (4.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 510 | (4.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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［Part 3／5］
Mathematics performance and quality assurance and school improvement

|  |  | Mathematics performance，by whether the school principal reported that the school has the following measures aimed at quality assurance and improvement： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | External evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Seek written feedback from students （e．g．regarding lessons，teachers or resources） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | No |  | Yes |  |  Performance <br> difference <br> （yes－no） <br> after <br> Performance  <br> difference  <br> （yes－no） accounting <br> for student <br> ESCS |  |  |  | Performance difference （yes－no） after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  | No |  | Yes |  | Performance difference （yes－no） |  | Performance difference （yes－no） after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference （yes－no） after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| 0 | Australia | 509 | （3．5） | 502 | （2．3） | －7 | （4．8） | －6 | （4．2） | －5 | （4．1） | 500 | （3．5） | 506 | （2．1） | 6 | （4．5） | ， | （3．9） | －4 | （3．9） |
| U | Austria | 506 | （4．2） | 510 | （9．5） | 4 | （12．3） | 3 | （10．4） |  | （9．3） | 499 | （12．4） | 509 | （4．0） | 9 | （14．8） | 11 | （11．3） | 15 | （8．7） |
| － | Belgium | 503 | （7．2） | 521 | （3．7） | 18 | （9．9） | 9 | （7．9） | －6 | （5．9） | 511 | （3．1） | 524 | （6．3） | 13 | （8．2） | 13 | （6．4） | 14 | （5．8） |
|  | Canada | 520 | （3．0） | 517 | （3．0） | －3 | （4．8） | －4 | （4．1） | －6 | （3．8） | 514 | （2．3） | 525 | （3．1） | 10 | （3．8） | 6 | （3．3） | 2 | （3．3） |
|  | Chile | 412 | （4．4） | 432 | （5．2） | 20 | （7．6） | 13 | （4．9） | 8 | （4．3） | 418 | （5．6） | 428 | （4．4） | 10 | （8．1） | 5 | （5．6） | 2 | （5．1） |
|  | Czech Republic | 496 | （6．8） | 501 | （5．1） | 5 | （9．6） | 4 | （7．6） | 1 | （6．0） | 494 | （7．9） | 502 | （5．5） | 8 | （11．3） | 7 | （9．2） | 4 | （7．1） |
|  | Denmark | 505 | （5．1） | 497 | （3．2） | －8 | （6．5） | －4 | （4．2） | 0 | （3．7） | 500 | （3．3） | 499 | （4．0） | －1 | （5．1） | －1 | （3．6） | －1 | （3．5） |
|  | Estonia | 524 | （4．6） | 519 | （2．3） | －5 | （5．2） | －3 | （4．8） | －1 | （4．8） | 517 | （4．6） | 522 | （2．4） | 4 | （5．4） | 3 | （5．3） | 1 | （5．6） |
|  | Finland | 519 | （2．5） | 518 | （3．1） | －1 | （4．0） | －3 | （3．6） | －3 | （3．5） | 517 | （4．1） | 519 | （2．4） | 2 | （4．9） | 2 | （4．3） | 2 | （4．1） |
|  | France | 499 | （7．0） | 493 | （5．8） | －5 | （11．2） | －5 | （8．0） | －1 | （6．2） | 497 | （3．5） | 494 | （16．0） | －3 | （17．7） | －1 | （13．9） | 0 | （10．8） |
|  | Germany | 497 | （6．7） | 523 | （5．3） | 26 | （10．3） | 18 | （7．9） | 15 | （5．8） | 510 | （6．2） | 516 | （6．7） | 6 | （11．0） | 4 | （8．7） | 4 | （5．7） |
|  | Greece | 453 | （2．9） | 455 | （24．4） | 2 | （25．6） | －2 | （18．7） | －7 | （14．5） | 453 | （3．2） | 452 | （6．9） | －1 | （8．4） | －4 | （6．5） | －9 | （5．9） |
|  | Hungary | 476 | （8．5） | 479 | （5．8） | 3 | （12．5） | ， | （8．9） | －2 | （6．1） | 464 | （12．7） | 481 | （4．2） | 17 | （14．6） | 13 | （9．6） | 8 | （7．3） |
|  | Iceland | 488 | （3．3） | 495 | （1．8） | 7 | （3．2） | 6 | （3．2） | 3 | （3．2） | 492 | （2．5） | 495 | （2．2） | 3 | （3．1） | ， | （3．1） |  | （3．1） |
|  | Ireland | 513 | （5．4） | 500 | （3．2） | －12 | （7．0） | －8 | （5．1） | －2 | （4．7） | 501 | （3．2） | 507 | （6．1） | 6 | （7．5） | 4 | （5．0） | 2 | （3．7） |
|  | Israel | 473 | （8．5） | 462 | （5．5） | －11 | （10．0） | －12 | （7．7） | －12 | （6．6） | 464 | （6．1） | 468 | （7．6） | 4 | （9．9） | 5 | （7．4） | 9 | （6．0） |
|  | Italy | 486 | （2．8） | 491 | （5．6） | 5 | （6．8） | 5 | （6．0） | 5 | （5．3） | 486 | （3．2） | 490 | （4．7） | 4 | （6．5） | 4 | （5．4） | 4 | （4．5） |
|  | Japan | 537 | （10．5） | 536 | （3．9） | －1 | （11．6） | 4 | （9．5） | 18 | （8．0） | 529 | （9．6） | 539 | （3．7） | 10 | （10．5） |  | （9．1） | 6 | （7．8） |
|  | Korea | 541 | （9．1） | 557 | （5．6） | 17 | （11．2） | 17 | （8．9） | 17 | （6．5） | 533 | （12．7） | 558 | （5．2） | 25 | （14．3） | 17 | （12．7） | 3 | （10．9） |
|  | Luxembourg | 479 | （1．6） | 511 | （1．8） | 32 | （2．1） | 21 | （2．3） | 6 | （2．3） | 491 | （1．4） | 496 | （2．2） | 5 | （2．4） |  | （2．6） | －5 | （2．4） |
|  | Mexico | 412 | （3．0） | 414 | （1．7） | 2 | （3．6） | 1 | （3．1） | 0 | （3．0） | 398 | （3．0） | 419 | （1．6） | 21 | （3．5） | 17 | （3．1） | 14 | （3．1） |
|  | Netherlands | 509 | （16．7） | 522 | （5．2） | 13 | （19．0） | 13 | （17．3） | 11 | （14．0） | 463 | （18．2） | 526 | （4．4） | 63 | （18．8） | 50 | （17．3） | 6 | （13．0） |
|  | New Zealand | 512 | （10．3） | 501 | （2．8） | －11 | （11．2） | －3 | （7．4） | 6 | （6．5） | 536 | （18．1） | 501 | （2．6） | －35 | （18．8） | －33 | （14．5） | －31 | （12．5） |
|  | Norway | 492 | （4．0） | 489 | （4．3） | －3 | （6．1） | －4 | （5．3） | －5 | （4．9） | 486 | （4．6） | 496 | （3．8） | 10 | （6．5） | 7 | （5．6） | 4 | （4．8） |
|  | Poland | 516 | （6．4） | 518 | （4．4） | 2 | （7．7） | 1 | （5．5） | 0 | （4．9） | 515 | （6．4） | 518 | （4．4） | 3 | （7．6） | 4 | （5．8） | 4 | （5．1） |
|  | Portugal | 466 | （9．9） | 490 | （3．9） | 24 | （10．0） | 23 | （7．1） | 23 | （6．8） | 486 | （9．0） | 487 | （4．9） | 1 | （11．1） | 8 | （6．7） | 13 | （6．2） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 487 | （5．6） | 471 | （7．3） | －16 | （10．8） | －8 | （7．3） | －1 | （6．0） | 474 | （7．3） | 489 | （6．6） | 15 | （11．9） | 6 | （7．6） | －1 | （5．2） |
|  | Slovenia | 512 | （1．8） | 484 | （2．2） | －28 | （2．9） | －22 | （2．9） | －7 | （2．9） | 503 | （3．4） | 503 | （1．6） | 0 | （4．0） | －2 | （3．5） | －5 | （3．4） |
|  | Spain | 480 | （4．6） | 486 | （2．3） | 6 | （5．4） | 1 | （4．1） | －1 | （3．8） | 479 | （3．9） | 487 | （2．3） | 8 | （4．7） |  | （3．7） | 5 | （3．6） |
|  | Sweden | 468 | （4．5） | 483 | （3．0） | 15 | （5．7） | 11 | （4．9） | 7 | （5．0） | 472 | （5．9） | 480 | （2．8） | 9 | （7．0） | 4 | （5．4） | 2 | （4．5） |
|  | Switzerland | 535 | （4．9） | 531 | （4．4） | －4 | （6．8） | －3 | （6．0） | －2 | （5．9） | 524 | （6．7） | 536 | （4．1） | 11 | （8．1） | 14 | （6．7） | 16 | （5．9） |
|  | Turkey | 459 | （14．5） | 446 | （5．9） | －14 | （16．9） | －9 | （15．0） | －2 | （12．7） | 431 | （16．3） | 451 | （5．1） | 20 | （17．1） | 14 | （15．1） | 3 | （13．4） |
|  | United Kingdom | 536 | （12．5） | 490 | （3．9） | －46 | （13．5） | －31 | （10．9） | －14 | （9．1） | 490 | （10．6） | 497 | （3．7） | 7 | （11．7） |  | （7．6） | 0 | （5．5） |
|  | United States | 498 | （11．1） | 480 | （3．9） | －18 | （12．0） | －11 | （9．2） | －6 | （7．6） | 477 | （5．5） | 486 | （5．3） | 9 | （8．0） | 6 | （6．2） | 2 | （5．4） |
|  | OECD average | 495 | （1．3） | 495 | （1．0） | 0 | （1．8） | 0 | （1．4） | 1 | （1．2） | 489 | （1．4） | 497 | （0．9） | 8 | （1．8） | 6 | （1．4） | 3 | （1．2） |
|  | Albania | 390 | （4．4） | 395 | （2．6） | 5 | （5．4） | c | c | c | c | 396 | （4．0） | 393 | （2．5） | －3 | （5．0） | C | c | c | c |
| $\stackrel{\text { E }}{ }$ | Argentina | 394 | （4．3） | 382 | （5．3） | －12 | （6．7） | －10 | （5．5） | －7 | （5．7） | 393 | （4．6） | 385 | （5．6） | －9 | （7．6） | －2 | （5．7） | 6 | （4．6） |
| \％ | Brazil | 387 | （6．3） | 392 | （2．5） | 5 | （7．2） | 6 | （5．1） | 8 | （3．6） | 383 | （4．1） | 395 | （2．8） | 12 | （5．2） | 8 | （4．6） | 3 | （4．5） |
|  | Bulgaria | 388 | （20．2） | 441 | （4．1） | 54 | （21．1） | 37 | （15．1） | 20 | （12．4） | 448 | （12．0） | 438 | （4．8） | －10 | （13．6） | －2 | （10．2） | 6 | （7．9） |
|  | Colombia | 369 | （8．6） | 379 | （3．4） | 10 | （9．8） | 8 | （7．8） | 6 | （7．0） | 360 | （5．3） | 384 | （3．4） | 24 | （6．7） | 17 | （5．3） | 11 | （4．9） |
|  | Costa Rica | 412 | （4．7） | 402 | （4．8） | －9 | （7．1） | －3 | （5．4） | 2 | （4．9） | 408 | （5．3） | 406 | （4．1） | －1 | （7．2） | －2 | （5．2） | －2 | （4．8） |
|  | Croatia | 450 | （9．7） | 476 | （4．4） | 26 | （11．7） | 23 | （9．8） | 17 | （8．7） | 468 | （7．2） | 474 | （5．8） | 6 | （10．8） | 1 | （8．9） | －7 | （6．6） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 463 | （2．6） | 431 | （1．2） | －32 | （3．0） | －21 | （2．9） | －4 | （2．9） | 444 | （1．6） | 433 | （1．8） | －11 | （2．5） | －12 | （2．5） | －13 | （2．5） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 564 | （15．6） | 561 | （3．7） | －3 | （17．1） | －3 | （14．3） | －5 | （11．6） | 546 | （9．6） | 565 | （4．6） | 18 | （12．3） | 16 | （10．7） | 9 | （10．1） |
|  | Indonesia | 368 | （7．5） | 376 | （4．7） | 8 | （8．8） | 8 | （8．0） | 8 | （8．0） | 367 | （7．8） | 377 | （4．6） | 10 | （9．3） | 11 | （7．8） | 13 | （7．0） |
|  | Jordan | 375 | （5．3） | 390 | （4．0） | 14 | （6．8） | 11 | （5．6） | 7 | （5．1） | 388 | （4．0） | 385 | （3．8） | －2 | （5．2） | －4 | （4．5） | －6 | （4．4） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 424 | （13．4） | 432 | （3．0） | 8 | （13．4） | 11 | （11．5） | 13 | （9．7） | 432 | （7．5） | 432 | （3．4） | 0 | （8．4） | －2 | （7．2） | －5 | （6．7） |
|  | Latvia | 488 | （5．3） | 489 | （3．3） | 1 | （6．2） | 0 | （5．1） | －1 | （5．6） | 472 | （6．9） | 494 | （3．2） | 23 | （7．9） | 16 | （6．4） | 10 | （5．7） |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | 539 | （4．4） | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 536 | （4．2） | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 476 | （4．8） | 483 | （4．1） | 7 | （7．0） | 5 | （5．6） | 2 | （4．8） | 488 | （6．3） | 476 | （3．3） | －11 | （7．6） | －9 | （6．0） | －7 | （5．8） |
|  | Macao－China | 528 | （1．6） | 544 | （1．2） | 16 | （2．0） | 12 | （1．9） | 8 | （1．9） | 525 | （2．0） | 544 | （1．1） | 19 | （2．3） | 16 | （2．2） | 11 | （2．2） |
|  | Malaysia | 412 | （5．0） | 422 | （3．9） | 10 | （7．0） | 5 | （5．2） | －2 | （4．9） | 413 | （6．7） | 424 | （3．6） | 10 | （7．7） | 4 | （6．3） | －2 | （5．9） |
|  | Montenegro | c | c | 411 | （1．1） | c | c | c |  | c | c | 433 | （1．7） | 394 | （1．3） | －39 | （2．2） | －31 | （2．3） | －11 | （2．4） |
|  | Peru | 370 | （4．3） | 364 | （7．1） | －6 | （8．4） | －3 | （5．5） | 0 | （4．3） | 370 | （7．0） | 367 | （4．7） | －3 | （8．8） | －3 | （5．3） | －3 | （4．5） |
|  | Qatar | 406 | （2．1） | 370 | （0．8） | －36 | （2．3） | －28 | （2．4） | －14 | （2．4） | 427 | （2．3） | 369 | （0．8） | －58 | （2．4） | －52 | （2．3） | －41 | （2．3） |
|  | Romania | 437 | （11．6） | 446 | （4．1） | 9 | （12．5） | 7 | （9．0） | 5 | （7．3） | 444 | （9．7） | 445 | （4．3） | 1 | （11．0） | 3 | （7．9） | 3 | （6．3） |
|  | Russian Federation | 461 | （20．0） | 483 | （3．1） | 22 | （20．7） | 11 | （16．0） | 3 | （13．7） | 469 | （7．6） | 485 | （3．6） | 16 | （8．7） | 8 | （7．3） | 2 | （7．3） |
|  | Serbia | 446 | （6．8） | 451 | （6．7） | 5 | （10．9） | 2 | （9．1） | －5 | （6．9） | 444 | （6．1） | 458 | （8．0） | 13 | （11．8） | 9 | （9．7） | －2 | （6．7） |
|  | Shanghai－China | 611 | （10．4） | 613 | （3．8） | 2 | （11．8） | －1 | （9．4） | －6 | （8．9） | 599 | （20．2） | 614 | （3．3） | 15 | （20．9） | －1 | （15．2） | －23 | （8．8） |
|  | Singapore | 552 | （4．9） | 576 | （1．3） | 23 | （5．1） | 18 | （5．5） | 8 | （5．4） | 548 | （3．6） | 578 | （1．4） | 30 | （3．9） | 21 | （3．8） | 6 | （3．7） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 546 | （11．7） | 563 | （4．6） | 17 | （13．9） | 16 | （10．3） | 14 | （7．3） | 574 | （6．2） | 549 | （5．7） | －25 | （9．8） | －16 | （7．2） | －1 | （6．6） |
|  | Thailand | 408 | （10．7） | 427 | （3．5） | 19 | （11．7） | 22 | （18．3） | 25 | （25．7） | 421 | （7．9） | 428 | （3．9） | 7 | （9．0） | 7 | （7．3） | 7 | （6．5） |
|  | Tunisia | 383 | （6．0） | 395 | （6．9） | 12 | （9．8） | 11 | （8．3） | 9 | （7．4） | 386 | （5．2） | 390 | （8．1） | 4 | （10．1） | 4 | （8．5） | 5 | （7．9） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 425 | （11．1） | 436 | （2．6） | 10 | （11．8） | 5 | （10．6） | －3 | （11．3） | 451 | （6．2） | 431 | （2．9） | －20 | （7．2） | －16 | （6．6） | －12 | （6．4） |
|  | Uruguay | 413 | （4．3） | 404 | （6．8） | －9 | （9．7） | －6 | （6．2） | －4 | （4．7） | 411 | （4．9） | 409 | （5．0） | －2 | （8．3） | －3 | （5．7） | －3 | （5．2） |
|  | Viet Nam | 513 | （7．5） | 508 | （6．8） | －5 | （10．6） | －3 | （8．4） | －1 | （7．1） | 495 | （12．4） | 514 | （5．2） | 19 | （13．4） | 15 | （11．0） | 11 | （9．5） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of students．
See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 侢列四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
[Part 4/5]
Mathematics performance and quality assurance and school improvement
Table IV.1.18 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Mathematics performance, by whether the school principal reported that the school has the following measures aimed at quality assurance and improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Teacher mentoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Regular consultation with one or more experts over a period of at least six months with the aim of improving the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | No | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  | No |  | Yes |  | Performance difference (yes - no) |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS |  | Performance difference (yes - no) after accounting for student ESCS and school average ESCS |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Mean } \\ \text { score } \end{array} & \text { S.E. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score | S.E. | Score dif | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 505 (7.8) | 504 | (1.8) | -1 | (8.5) | -3 | (6.9) | -7 | (5.9) | 510 | (3.7) | 502 | (2.0) | -7 | (4.3) | -5 | (3.6) | -4 | (3.4) |
| U | Austria | 505 (16.1) | 508 | (3.5) | 3 | (17.8) | 4 | (13.9) | 5 | (12.2) | 510 | (6.4) | 505 | (5.4) | -5 | (10.2) | -8 | (7.7) | -13 | (6.2) |
|  | Belgium | 491 (6.9) | 527 | (3.0) | 36 | (8.6) | 30 | (6.5) | 21 | (5.6) | 513 | (4.7) | 518 | (6.8) | 4 | (10.7) | 7 | (7.8) | 10 | (5.1) |
|  | Canada | 526 (4.8) | 517 | (2.3) | -9 | (5.7) | -10 | (4.7) | -11 | (4.3) | 525 | (3.3) | 516 | (2.6) | -10 | (4.5) | -12 | (3.8) | -13 | (3.4) |
|  | Chile | 419 (3.5) | 436 | (8.0) | 18 | (9.2) | 12 | (6.3) | 9 | (5.7) | 419 | (3.8) | 427 | (6.5) | 8 | (8.1) | 6 | (5.4) | 5 | (4.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 528 (7.9) | 497 | (3.6) | -30 | (8.4) | -32 | (8.7) | -35 | (16.5) | 506 | (5.1) | 484 | (8.4) | -22 | (11.6) | -22 | (8.8) | -21 | (6.3) |
|  | Denmark | 498 (3.7) | 501 | (3.6) | , | (5.2) | 0 | (3.6) | -2 | (3.4) | 497 | (4.0) | 503 | (3.6) | 6 | (5.5) | 5 | (3.7) | 4 | (3.4) |
|  | Estonia | 503 (4.7) | 525 | (2.3) | 21 | (5.3) | 14 | (5.1) | 8 | (5.4) | 522 | (2.9) | 517 | (3.6) | -4 | (4.8) | -6 | (4.3) | -7 | (4.2) |
|  | Finland | 519 (2.7) | 518 | (2.5) | -1 | (3.4) | -1 | (2.9) | -2 | (3.0) | 519 | (2.2) | 516 | (5.0) | -4 | (5.5) | -3 | (4.8) | -3 | (4.9) |
|  | France | 495 (4.0) | 496 | (13.5) | 1 | (15.6) | -6 | (11.8) | -12 | (9.7) | 498 | (4.0) | 488 | (12.6) | -10 | (15.0) | -11 | (11.1) | -13 | (8.3) |
|  | Germany | 514 (5.5) | 511 | (8.4) | -4 | (12.0) | -4 | (9.3) | -2 | (6.7) | 512 | (4.3) | 522 | (11.0) | 10 | (13.1) | 14 | (9.3) | 17 | (5.4) |
|  | Greece | 463 (11.6) | 451 | (2.9) | -13 | (12.8) | -8 | (9.6) | -4 | (8.2) | 466 | (8.0) | 449 | (3.5) | -18 | (10.1) | -13 | (7.0) | -9 | (5.5) |
|  | Hungary | 465 (9.4) | 482 | (4.7) | 17 | (12.1) | 12 | (8.1) | 7 | (6.6) | 478 | (4.4) | 476 | (13.1) | -1 | (15.4) | -3 | (10.3) | -7 | (6.9) |
|  | Iceland | 492 (1.8) | 501 | (4.0) | 9 | (4.1) | 9 | (4.3) | 8 | (4.3) | 491 | (2.3) | 494 | (2.5) | 2 | (3.2) | 4 | (3.2) | 5 | (3.3) |
|  | Ireland | 499 (4.4) | 505 | (3.4) | 6 | (5.9) | 3 | (4.2) | -1 | (3.6) | 507 | (4.3) | 497 | (5.0) | -11 | (7.6) | -8 | (5.3) | -5 | (3.7) |
|  | Israel | 457 (33.3) | 467 | (4.7) | 9 | (33.8) | 3 | (29.5) | -7 | (24.3) | 479 | (8.9) | 460 | (7.3) | -19 | (12.6) | -11 | (10.0) | -3 | (8.1) |
|  | Italy | 489 (5.7) | 487 | (2.7) | -2 | (6.6) | -1 | (5.5) | 1 | (4.3) | 490 | (2.8) | 481 | (5.3) | -9 | (6.6) | -8 | (5.5) | -7 | (4.5) |
|  | Japan | 553 (14.5) | 534 | (3.9) | -19 | (15.6) | -12 | (13.5) | 3 | (10.5) | 537 | (3.9) | 522 | (13.0) | -15 | (14.2) | -14 | (14.2) | -10 | (15.0) |
|  | Korea | 539 (15.1) | 556 | (5.1) | 17 | (16.6) | 16 | (13.2) | 16 | (9.6) | 557 | (6.6) | 555 | (6.9) | -2 | (10.2) | 3 | (8.6) | 14 | (6.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 478 (2.0) | 498 | (1.3) | 19 | (2.1) | 15 | (2.2) | 8 | (2.1) | 494 | (1.6) | 489 | (1.7) | -5 | (2.1) | -5 | (2.1) | -6 | (2.1) |
|  | Mexico | 415 (2.5) | 412 | (2.5) | -3 | (4.1) | -5 | (3.2) | -7 | (2.7) | 411 | (2.1) | 415 | (2.2) | 4 | (3.4) | -1 | (3.0) | -5 | (2.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 428 (26.8) | 522 | (4.4) | 94 | (27.6) | 84 | (24.8) | 53 | (21.7) | 526 | (7.1) | 512 | (8.4) | -14 | (12.7) | -12 | (11.3) | -6 | (9.4) |
|  | New Zealand | 483 (24.0) | 502 | (2.5) | 19 | (24.5) | 10 | (14.7) | 1 | (13.2) | 508 | (5.4) | 498 | (3.0) | -9 | (6.6) | -5 | (4.8) | -2 | (4.6) |
|  | Norway | 484 (5.1) | 493 | (3.4) | 9 | (6.2) | 7 | (5.1) | 7 | (4.6) | 493 | (4.2) | 487 | (4.0) | -5 | (6.2) | -5 | (5.4) | -6 | (5.3) |
|  | Poland | 524 (12.1) | 516 | (3.5) | -8 | (11.9) | -15 | (8.9) | -19 | (7.9) | 512 | (4.0) | 526 | (6.3) | 14 | (7.1) | 10 | (5.4) | 7 | (5.0) |
|  | Portugal | 473 (9.4) | 490 | (4.0) | 17 | (10.2) | 12 | (7.0) | 9 | (6.6) | 484 | (4.8) | 492 | (8.1) | 7 | (10.0) | 2 | (5.9) | -1 | (5.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 515 (17.2) | 476 | (4.2) | -39 | (19.5) | -30 | (11.7) | -21 | (8.8) | 478 | (7.0) | 484 | (6.5) | 6 | (11.6) | 3 | (8.5) | 0 | (6.6) |
|  | Slovenia | 486 (2.1) | 512 | (1.8) | 26 | (2.9) | 19 | (3.0) | 6 | (2.9) | 508 | (2.0) | 499 | (2.5) | -9 | (3.6) | -6 | (3.2) | 0 | (3.0) |
|  | Spain | 481 (2.4) | 492 | (4.3) | 12 | (5.4) | 4 | (3.9) | 0 | (3.8) | 481 | (2.6) | 492 | (3.7) | 11 | (4.9) | 4 | (3.4) | 0 | (3.2) |
|  | Sweden | 482 (3.9) | 476 | (3.0) | -6 | (5.0) | -1 | (4.1) | 2 | (4.0) | 478 | (3.0) | 479 | (5.5) | 1 | (7.0) | 0 | (5.1) | 0 | (4.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 516 (6.9) | 540 | (4.4) | 23 | (8.7) | 23 | (7.0) | 21 | (5.9) | 535 | (3.3) | 526 | (7.9) | -9 | (8.3) | -8 | (7.6) | -7 | (7.6) |
|  | Turkey | 429 (12.4) | 451 | (4.7) | 21 | (11.8) | 12 | (10.2) | -6 | (9.6) | 443 | (8.9) | 451 | (6.5) | 8 | (11.8) |  | (10.2) | -11 | (9.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 501 (10.2) | 495 | (3.8) | -6 | (11.5) | -6 | (7.7) | -8 | (5.0) | 524 | (8.2) | 487 | (4.1) | -38 | (8.9) | -26 | (7.0) | -12 | (6.3) |
|  | United States | c c | 483 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 500 | (7.0) | 477 | (4.5) | -23 | (8.6) | -18 | (6.9) | -15 | (6.0) |
|  | OECD average | 490 (2.0) | 497 | (0.8) | 7 | (2.3) | 5 | (1.8) | 1 | (1.6) | 497 | (0.9) | 493 | (1.1) | -5 | (1.6) | -4 | (1.2) | -4 | (1.0) |
|  | Albania | 398 (5.9) | 394 | (2.2) | -5 | (6.3) | c | c | c | c | 388 | (3.3) | 397 | (2.6) | 9 | (4.4) | c | c | c | c |
| $\stackrel{1}{5}$ | Argentina | 385 (5.2) | 394 | (4.3) | 10 | (7.0) | 7 | (5.3) | 5 | (4.8) | 392 | (4.4) | 387 | (5.7) | -6 | (7.6) | -4 | (5.7) | -3 | (5.3) |
| \% | Brazil | 391 (10.9) | 391 | (2.3) | 0 | (11.2) | 3 | (7.3) | 6 | (4.2) | 390 | (3.5) | 393 | (3.6) | 3 | (5.6) | 0 | (4.1) | -4 | (3.3) |
|  | Bulgaria | 435 (8.8) | 441 | (5.5) | 6 | (11.6) | 6 | (8.0) | 6 | (5.7) | 430 | (8.5) | 445 | (5.8) | 15 | (11.8) | 11 | (8.3) | 7 | (6.3) |
|  | Colombia | 372 (5.4) | 379 | (3.8) | 7 | (7.0) | 4 | (5.6) | 1 | (5.3) | 371 | (4.9) | 382 | (4.5) | 10 | (7.4) | 3 | (5.8) | -2 | (5.2) |
|  | Costa Rica | 407 (3.8) | 409 | (7.8) | 3 | (9.3) | 1 | (6.5) | 0 | (5.2) | 414 | (5.0) | 399 | (4.4) | -15 | (7.4) | -7 | (5.4) | 0 | (4.7) |
|  | Croatia | c c | 471 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 470 | (8.1) | 473 | (5.1) | 2 | (11.0) | 1 | (9.1) | -1 | (6.9) |
|  | Cyprus* | 416 (4.9) | 440 | (1.2) | 24 | (5.2) | 13 | (5.1) | -2 | (4.9) | 454 | (1.8) | 428 | (1.4) | -26 | (2.3) | -16 | (2.3) | -2 | (2.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 567 (15.8) | 561 | (3.7) | -6 | (17.4) | -7 | (14.2) | -7 | (11.7) | 561 | (5.2) | 564 | (6.6) | 3 | (10.1) | 3 | (8.6) | 4 | (8.1) |
|  | Indonesia | c c | 375 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 369 | (6.2) | 377 | (5.2) | 8 | (8.2) | 3 | (7.2) | -2 | (7.1) |
|  | Jordan | 374 (6.8) | 391 | (3.9) | 17 | (8.3) | 14 | (7.3) | 10 | (6.8) | 381 | (5.2) | 389 | (4.6) | 9 | (7.5) | 6 | (6.5) | 1 | (5.9) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 424 (22.4) | 432 | (3.1) | 9 | (22.8) | 7 | (20.3) | 5 | (17.6) | 441 | (9.7) | 430 | (3.1) | -11 | (10.2) | -7 | (8.7) | -3 | (7.5) |
|  | Latvia | 477 (5.4) | 493 | (3.5) | 16 | (6.8) | 8 | (5.6) | 1 | (5.5) | 489 | (3.7) | 487 | (5.0) | -2 | (6.8) | -3 | (5.3) | -3 | (4.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c c | 537 | (4.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 500 | (6.5) | 552 | (5.3) | 52 | (8.6) | 46 | (9.1) | 8 | (10.0) |
|  | Lithuania | $478 \quad$ (5.2) | 480 | (3.9) | 2 | (7.4) | -1 | (6.0) | -6 | (5.1) | 480 | (3.3) | 478 | (4.7) | -2 | (6.0) | -4 | (4.9) | -7 | (4.6) |
|  | Macao-China | c c | 541 | (1.0) | c | c | c | c | c |  | 534 | (1.4) | 543 | (1.3) | 9 | (1.9) | 3 | (2.0) | -5 | (2.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 410 (9.9) | 422 | (3.4) | 11 | (10.7) | 7 | (8.1) | 2 | (6.8) | 414 | (8.2) | 423 | (3.4) | 9 | (8.9) | 5 | (8.1) | 2 | (9.1) |
|  | Montenegro | c c | 410 | (1.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 430 | (1.9) | 402 | (1.3) | -28 | (2.3) | -20 | (2.5) | 1 | (2.4) |
|  | Peru | c c | 369 | (3.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 370 | (4.8) | 366 | (6.5) | -4 | (8.5) | -2 | (5.4) | 0 | (4.2) |
|  | Qatar | c c | 375 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 396 | (2.5) | 373 | (0.8) | -23 | (2.8) | -15 | (2.8) | 4 | (2.8) |
|  | Romania | 444 (14.1) | 445 | (4.1) | 1 | (15.3) | 1 | (11.1) | 2 | (8.9) | 444 | (6.9) | 445 | (5.0) | 0 | (9.1) | 2 | (7.0) | 3 | (6.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 476 (9.7) | 482 | (3.1) | 7 | (10.1) | -5 | (9.9) | -14 | (10.5) | 475 | (3.9) | 489 | (4.5) | 14 | (5.8) | 10 | (5.1) | 7 | (5.5) |
|  | Serbia | 437 (42.1) | 450 | (4.0) | 12 | (42.9) | 10 | (35.9) | 12 | (22.3) | 450 | (6.4) | 450 | (6.4) | 0 | (10.1) | 1 | (8.3) | 1 | (6.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | c c | 614 | (3.4) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 582 | (22.5) | 615 | (3.5) | 33 | (23.3) | 23 | (19.2) | 7 | (15.4) |
|  | Singapore | c c | 574 | (1.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 561 | (2.1) | 578 | (1.7) | 17 | (2.8) | 9 | (2.7) | -4 | (2.7) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 570 (10.4) | 553 | (5.4) | -17 | (13.5) | -14 | (9.8) | -10 | (6.4) | 559 | (5.5) | 553 | (10.1) | -6 | (13.2) | -8 | (10.2) | -11 | (7.6) |
|  | Thailand | c c | 428 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 431 | (15.6) | 426 | (3.4) | -4 | (16.1) | -3 | (13.4) | -2 | (11.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 400 (13.7) | 386 | (4.3) | -14 | (14.7) | -8 | (11.6) | 0 | (8.8) | 389 | (4.3) | 380 | (12.3) | -9 | (13.4) | -7 | (10.6) | -4 | (8.3) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 411 (7.9) | 437 | (2.7) | 26 | (8.7) | 21 | (7.9) | 14 | (8.6) | 419 | (3.9) | 441 | (3.1) | 22 | (5.2) | 14 | (4.3) | 0 | (3.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 427 (7.4) | 405 | (3.3) | -23 | (8.6) | -12 | (6.1) | -4 | (5.5) | 409 | (3.6) | 411 | (9.7) | 2 | (11.7) | -2 | (7.2) | -5 | (5.4) |
|  | Viet Nam | c c | 510 | (4.7) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 509 | (7.7) | 514 | (6.6) | 5 | (10.6) | 6 | (8.8) | 7 |  |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 可ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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Table IV.1.18 Results based on school principals' reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of students.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and age at which students start primary school
Table IV.1.21 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 <br> (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics performance, by the age at which students started primary school |  |  |  | Mathematics performance, by the age at which students started primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance, by the age at which students started primary school |  |  |  |
|  | 5 years old or younger | 6 years old | 7 years old | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \text { years old } \\ \text { or older } \end{array}$ | 5 years old or younger | 6 years old |  | 7 years old |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \text { years old } \\ \text { or older } \end{array}$ | 5 years old or younger | 6 years old | 7 years old | 8 years old or older |
|  | Mean score S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { score } \end{aligned} \quad \text { S.E. }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { score } \\ & \text { s.E. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Mean } \\ \text { score } \end{array} & \text { S.E. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mean score S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \quad \text { S.E. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered} \text { S.E. }$ | Score dif. S.E. |
| A Australia | 532 (2.1) | $517 \quad(3.3)$ | 494 (10.1) | 473 (16.2) | 513 (2.0) | 502 | (2.3) | 486 | (5.4) | C c | -19 (3.4) | -15 (4.5) | -7 (11.6) | c |
| O Austria | 549 (8.4) | $521 \quad$ (3.2) | 474 (4.7) | 429 (16.0) | $542 \quad$ (8.1) | 518 | (2.7) | 467 | (3.7) | 394 (16.6) | -8 (11.8) | -3 (4.6) | -7 (6.3) | -35 (23.2) |
| Belgium | 556 (3.8) | 546 (2.8) | 508 (5.6) | 425 (18.8) | 537 (3.0) | 521 | (2.3) | 482 | (6.4) | 470 (18.2) | -20 (5.2) | -24 (4.1) | -25 (8.8) | 45 (26.2) |
| Canada | 537 (1.6) | 548 (2.7) | 526 (6.8) | 471 (18.1) | $523 \quad(1.8)$ | 530 | (2.6) | 515 | (5.5) | 451 (9.3) | -14 (3.1) | -18 (4.2) | -11 (8.9) | -20 (20.4) |
| Czech Republic | 562 (18.3) | 541 (3.1) | 494 (4.7) | 450 (15.2) | 551 (15.9) | 517 | (3.1) | 475 | (3.8) | 392 (11.9) | -11 (24.3) | -24 (4.8) | -19 (6.3) | -58 (19.4) |
| Denmark | 533 (9.4) | 523 (3.5) | 516 (3.1) | 488 (7.8) | $497 \quad(7.3)$ | 505 | (2.9) | 506 | (2.4) | 471 (5.3) | -36 (12.1) | -18 (5.0) | -10 (4.3) | -17 (9.6) |
| Finland | c c | 553 (3.0) | 544 (2.0) | 457 (12.9) | 520 (25.8) | 530 | (2.9) | 519 | (2.1) | 421 (7.9) | $c \quad c$ | -23 (4.6) | -25 (3.5) | -36 (15.2) |
| France | 524 (4.3) | 516 (2.7) | $495 \quad(6.6)$ | c c | 517 (5.1) | 499 | (2.8) | 469 | (6.3) | 434 (11.2) | -6 (6.9) | -17 (4.4) | -26 (9.3) | c |
| Germany | 559 (13.3) | 529 (3.3) | 488 (4.0) | 398 (11.4) | 565 (7.9) | 530 | (3.1) | 486 | (4.1) | 391 (13.9) | 6 (15.6) | (5.0) | -3 (6.0) | -7 (18.0) |
| Greece | c c | 455 (4.1) | 429 (3.5) | c c | 461 (8.0) | 464 | (2.7) | 431 | (4.3) | 406 (10.5) | c c | 9 (5.2) | 2 (5.9) | c c |
| Hungary | c c | 515 (4.2) | $483 \quad(2.7)$ | 418 (7.5) | c c | 499 | (4.1) | 471 | (3.7) | 429 (8.4) | c c | -16 (6.2) | -12 (5.0) | 11 (11.4) |
| Iceland | $517 \quad$ (3.3) | 516 (1.8) | 503 (13.4) | c c | $502 \quad$ (3.3) | 495 | (2.0) | 458 | (8.4) | c c | -15 (5.0) | -21 (3.3) | -45 (16.0) | c c |
| Ireland | 507 (2.4) | 486 (7.4) | c c | c c | 505 (2.1) | 485 | (7.5) | c | c | c c | -1 (3.8) | -1 (10.7) | c c | c c |
| Italy | 480 (4.7) | 468 (3.0) | 418 (11.2) | c c | 508 (3.1) | 486 | (1.9) | 447 | (4.8) | 432 (12.2) | 27 (6.0) | 19 (4.0) | 28 (12.3) | c c |
| Japan |  | m m | m m | m m | c c | 538 | (3.6) | c | c | c c | m m | m m | m m | m |
| Korea | 535 (17.6) | $545 \quad$ (3.3) | 514 (6.8) | c c | 573 (20.0) | 579 | (5.3) | 543 | (4.9) | 490 (8.2) | 38 (26.7) | 34 (6.5) | 29 (8.6) | c c |
| Luxembourg | 493 (4.6) | 508 (1.7) | 473 (3.4) | 453 (12.1) | 518 (6.0) | 504 | (1.6) | 461 | (2.3) | 437 (7.1) | 25 (7.8) | -4 (3.0) | -11 (4.5) | -17 (14.1) |
| Mexico | 414 (4.1) | $392 \quad(4.2)$ | 365 (5.3) | 323 (17.3) | $430 \quad(2.6)$ | 418 | (1.3) | 395 | (2.5) | 357 (5.2) | 17 (5.2) | 25 (4.8) | 30 (6.1) | 34 (18.2) |
| Netherlands | 551 (4.9) | $551 \quad(3.5)$ | $527 \quad(5.2)$ | 495 (14.5) | $536 \quad(6.3)$ | 531 | (3.3) | 503 | (5.3) | 465 (12.5) | -15 (8.2) | -20 (5.2) | -24 (7.7) | -30 (19.2) |
| New Zealand | 527 (2.3) | 514 (8.0) | 527 (12.1) | c c | 504 (2.4) | 490 | (6.5) | 485 | (11.5) | 433 (19.5) | -23 (3.8) | -24 (10.5) | -42 (16.8) | c c |
| Norway | 485 (7.1) | 493 (3.3) | $504 \quad$ (2.6) | c c | $500 \quad(3.5)$ | 490 | (3.1) | 462 | (6.8) | 407 (16.2) | 15 (8.1) | -2 (4.9) | -42 (7.5) | c c |
| Poland | c c | 489 (7.0) | $495 \quad(2.4)$ | $453 \quad(7.3)$ | c c | c | c | 517 | (3.4) | c c | c c | c c | 22 (4.6) | c c |
| Portugal | 483 (4.0) | 473 (3.4) | 443 (6.1) | c c | 503 (4.8) | 495 | (3.7) | 453 | (7.0) | 449 (12.3) | 20 (6.5) | 22 (5.4) | 10 (9.5) | c c |
| Slovak Republic | 517 (11.8) | $510 \quad$ (3.4) | 477 (4.3) | 430 (18.2) | 503 (12.7) | 496 | (4.1) | 460 | (4.5) | 385 (17.1) | -14 (17.4) | -15 (5.7) | -17 (6.5) | -45 (25.1) |
| Spain | 497 (4.1) | 487 (2.4) | 459 (7.4) | c c | 489 (2.5) | 489 | (2.1) | 429 | (6.8) | c c | -8 (5.2) | 2 (3.7) | -30 (10.2) | c c |
| Sweden | 536 (9.7) | $510 \quad(4.5)$ | 517 (2.7) | 437 (14.0) | 472 (13.4) | 484 | (3.6) | 484 | (2.4) | 423 (8.9) | -65 (16.7) | -27 (6.1) | -32 (4.1) | -14 (16.7) |
| Switzerland | 546 (6.2) | 548 (5.6) | $524 \quad$ (3.2) | 474 (8.9) | $535 \quad(4.2)$ | 551 | (3.7) | 524 | (3.6) | 455 (5.9) | -10 (7.7) | 2 (7.0) | 0 (5.2) | -19 (10.8) |
| Turkey | c c | 440 (11.2) | 425 (7.7) | $370 \quad(8.8)$ | 425 (15.5) | 453 | (6.0) | 453 | (5.1) | 416 (5.9) | c c | 13 (12.8) | 27 (9.5) | 46 (10.7) |
| United States | 492 (2.8) | $488 \quad(3.7)$ | 478 (7.1) | 416 (13.3) | 483 (4.0) | 491 | (4.2) | 469 | (4.0) | 420 (11.1) | -10 (5.3) | 3 (5.9) | -9 (8.4) | 4 (17.4) |
| OECD average 2003 | 519 (1.7) | 506 (0.9) | 485 (1.2) | $437 \quad(3.2)$ | 508 (1.9) | 503 | (0.7) | 476 | (1.0) | 427 (2.5) | -5 (2.4) | -5 (1.2) | -9 (1.6) | -10 (4.5) |


| $\cdots$ | Brazil | 354 (7.9) | 383 | (6.4) | 364 | (4.9) | $303 \quad(7.5)$ | $385 \quad$ (3.1) | 409 | (3.5) | 399 | (2.1) | 371 (2.6) | 31 (8.7) | 26 | (7.5) | 35 | (5.7) | 68 (8.2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ | Hong Kong-China | 560 (6.4) | 564 | (4.3) | 526 | (4.9) | 477 (11.3) | 566 (5.4) | 570 | (3.3) | 552 | (5.1) | 487 (10.1) | 6 (8.6) | 6 | (5.8) | 26 | (7.3) | 10 (15.2) |
| ส | Indonesia | 374 (6.1) | 371 | (5.1) | 351 | (3.5) | $327 \quad$ (8.7) | $394 \quad$ (7.4) | 382 | (4.8) | 367 | (3.9) | 336 (7.0) | $20 \quad$ (9.8) | 11 | (7.2) | 16 | (5.6) | 10 (11.4) |
|  | Latvia | 514 (15.2) | 494 | (4.6) | 483 | (3.6) | 438 (6.9) | 450 (14.6) | 507 | (3.9) | 491 | (2.7) | 424 (8.8) | -64 (21.2) | 13 | (6.3) |  | (4.9) | -14 (11.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | C C | 558 | (7.6) | 528 | (6.4) | C | C | 542 | (7.8) | 535 | (7.5) | C | C | -15 | (11.0) |  | (10.0) | C |
|  | Macao-China | 537 (8.4) | 538 | (4.3) | 528 | (7.0) | 486 (15.8) | $546 \quad$ (3.7) | 551 | (1.6) | 530 | (2.9) | 498 (7.2) | 9 (9.4) | 13 | (5.0) |  | (7.8) | 13 (17.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | C C | 478 | (5.2) | 469 | (4.5) | $424 \quad(6.5)$ | 515 (21.3) | 496 | (3.5) | 477 | (3.3) | 424 (10.4) | c | 18 | (6.6) |  | (5.9) | 0 (12.4) |
|  | Thailand | 495 (22.7) | 431 | (4.4) | 413 | (3.1) | 386 (14.4) | $439 \quad$ (8.9) | 429 | (3.7) | 420 | (6.9) | C C | -56 (24.5) | -2 | (6.1) |  | (7.8) | c |
|  | Tunisia | 389 (5.5) | 361 | (2.6) | 331 | (6.4) | C C | $403 \quad(5.3)$ | 389 | (4.0) | 366 | (6.9) | c | 14 (7.9) | 28 | (5.1) | 5 | (9.7) | C |
|  | Uruguay | 433 (4.4) | 426 | (3.2) | 391 | (7.8) | 347 (20.9) | $427 \quad$ (4.4) | 414 | (3.0) | 385 | (8.5) | C C | -6 (6.5) | -12 | (4.8) | -5 | (11.7) | C |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
[Part 1/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and grade repetition
Table IV.1.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by whether students repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary and upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference <br> between <br> never <br> and once <br> or more <br> (never - <br> once or <br> more) |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference <br> between <br> never <br> and once <br> or more <br> (never - <br> once or <br> more) |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference <br> between <br> never <br> and once <br> or more <br> (never - <br> once or <br> more) |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 532 | (2.1) | 461 | (6.7) | 70 | (6.2) | 533 | (2.1) | 460 | (8.8) | 73 | (9.3) | 563 | (3.0) | c | c | c | c | 532 | (2.1) | 462 | (5.9) | 70 | (5.5) |
|  | Austria | 516 | (3.0) | 410 | (11.8) | 106 | (12.1) | 515 | (3.1) | 457 | (11.2) | 58 | (11.4) | 519 | (3.2) | 502 | (6.3) | 17 | (7.4) | 516 | (3.1) | 458 | (8.7) | 58 | (9.0) |
|  | Belgium | 564 | (2.1) | 419 | (3.5) | 145 | (3.8) | 556 | (2.3) | 473 | (6.4) | 83 | (6.4) | 560 | (2.3) | 502 | (4.5) | 58 | (4.7) | 569 | (2.0) | 455 | (3.8) | 114 | (4.0) |
|  | Canada | 544 | (1.6) | 441 | (3.9) | 103 | (4.1) | 545 | (1.6) | 459 | (4.2) | 86 | (4.2) | 551 | (1.7) | 464 | (8.7) | 87 | (8.7) | 547 | (1.6) | 454 | (3.2) | 93 | (3.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 526 | (3.1) | 418 | (11.9) | 108 | (11.8) | 528 | (3.1) | 412 | (15.8) | 116 | (15.0) | c | c | c | c | C | c | 526 | (3.0) | 416 | (10.0) | 110 | (9.4) |
|  | Denmark | 520 | (2.7) | 427 | (10.1) |  | (10.0) | 521 | (2.7) | 446 | (24.1) |  | (24.4) | 585 | (18.6) | C | c | C | c | 520 | (2.7) | 430 | (10.2) | 90 | 10.1) |
|  | Finland | 548 | (1.8) | 432 | (8.0) | 116 | (7.9) | 547 | (1.8) | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | c | c | 548 | (1.8) | 438 | (6.9) | 110 | (6.8) |
|  | France | 539 | (2.3) | 417 | (4.4) | 122 | (4.7) | 545 | (2.7) | 462 | (4.1) | 83 | (4.8) | C | c | C | c | C | c | 553 | (2.7) | 449 | (3.9) | 104 | (4.6) |
|  | Germany | 527 | (3.2) | 407 | (6.9) | 120 | (7.5) | 526 | (3.5) | 474 | (4.4) | 52 | (5.0) | C | c | C | c | C | c | 528 | (3.4) | 450 | (4.7) | 79 | (4.9) |
|  | Greece | 452 | (3.8) | 351 | (14.9) | 101 | (15.1) | 454 | (3.8) | 347 | (7.8) | 108 | (8.6) | 460 | (4.0) | 386 | (13.5) | 74 | (13.2) | 453 | (3.8) | 352 | (6.8) | 101 | (7.4) |
|  | Hungary | 498 | (2.9) | 388 | (8.3) | 111 | (9.2) | 498 | (2.9) | 406 | (8.3) | 92 | (8.3) | 503 | (3.0) | 462 | (7.6) | 41 | (7.4) | 499 | (3.0) | 417 | (5.4) | 81 | (5.9) |
|  | Iceland | 516 | (1.4) | C | c | C | C | 516 | (1.5) | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | c | C | C | 516 | (1.4) | C | c | C | C |
|  | Ireland | 513 | (2.4) | 453 | (4.6) |  | (4.4) | 513 | (2.4) | 426 | (16.9) |  | (16.9) | 532 | (3.8) | C | C | c | c | 513 | (2.4) | 452 | (4.5) | 61 | (4.4) |
|  | Italy | 476 | (2.8) | 322 | (25.6) | 153 | (25.8) | 477 | (2.8) | 381 | (9.3) | 97 | (8.9) | 478 | (2.8) | 416 | (4.8) | 62 | (4.3) | 478 | (2.8) | 397 | (5.9) | 81 | (5.5) |
|  | Japan | c | c | C | c | c |  | C | C | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | C | c | c | c | C | C |
|  | Korea | 543 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | 544 | (3.2) | C | c | C | c | 544 | (3.3) | C | c | c | c | 543 | (3.2) | c | c | c | C |
|  | Luxembourg | 516 | (1.3) | 411 | (3.4) | 105 | (3.8) | 517 | (1.4) | 473 | (2.5) | 45 | (3.0) | 556 | (2.3) | C | c | C | c | 522 | (1.4) | 451 | (1.8) | 71 | (2.5) |
|  | Mexico | 408 | (3.3) | 325 | (4.3) | 83 | (4.2) | 409 | (3.2) | 363 | (6.2) | 46 | (5.8) | 429 | (1.9) | 399 | (10.3) |  | (10.2) | 408 | (3.4) | 336 | (4.2) | 72 | (4.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 561 | (2.7) | 483 | (4.4) | 78 | (4.9) | 555 | (2.7) | 528 | (6.5) | 27 | (5.8) | C | c | c | c | c | c | 562 | (2.8) | 498 | (4.3) | 64 | (4.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 530 | (2.1) | 463 | (8.4) |  | (8.8) | 531 | (2.1) | 434 | (16.6) |  | (16.2) | 534 | (2.2) | c | c | C | c | 529 | (2.2) | 452 | (8.0) | 77 | (8.2) |
|  | Norway | c | C | C | c | C | C | C | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 495 | (2.2) | 347 | (10.1) | 149 | (9.6) | 495 | (2.2) | 373 | (11.5) | 123 | (11.1) | C | c | C | C | C | c | 496 | (2.2) | 362 | (8.8) | 134 | (8.5) |
|  | Portugal | 497 | (2.3) | 377 | (3.1) | 120 | (3.4) | 497 | (2.4) | 397 | (3.7) | 100 | (4.1) | 508 | (2.2) | C | c | C | c | 500 | (2.3) | 391 | (3.0) | 109 | (3.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 503 | (3.1) | 352 | (15.0) | 151 | (15.3) | 504 | (3.1) | 355 | (11.1) | 149 | (11.5) | C | c | c | c | C | c | 503 | (3.1) | 358 | (10.9) | 145 | (11.1) |
|  | Spain | 493 | (2.3) | 375 | (5.2) | 118 | (5.6) | 506 | (2.6) | 425 | (2.7) | 81 | (3.2) | C | c | C | c | C | c | 512 | (2.5) | 421 | (2.8) | 92 | (3.2) |
|  | Sweden | 513 | (2.4) | 440 | (11.7) |  | (11.6) | 514 | (2.3) | 456 | (21.6) |  | (21.7) | 566 | (15.3) | C | c | C | c | 513 | (2.4) | 444 | (11.8) | 69 | (11.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 546 | (3.2) | 437 | (3.6) | 109 | (4.7) | 543 | (3.5) | 501 | (5.1) | 42 | (4.8) | 582 | (12.4) | C | c | C | c | 546 | (3.4) | 461 | (3.2) | 85 | (3.9) |
|  | Turkey | 439 | (7.1) | 323 | (6.4) | 115 | (9.1) | 444 | (7.2) | 341 | (10.8) | 103 | (12.4) | 450 | (7.4) | 378 | (4.2) | 72 | (7.6) | 439 | (7.2) | 355 | (5.0) | 85 | (8.0) |
|  | United States | 495 | (2.7) | 403 | (5.4) | 92 | (5.1) | 494 | (2.7) | 390 | (6.8) | 104 | (7.0) | 502 | (2.8) | C | c | C | c | 496 | (2.7) | 403 | (4.1) | 93 | (4.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 511 | (0.6) | 403 | (1.9) | 107 | (1.9) | 512 | (0.6) | 427 | (2.3) | 83 | (2.3) | 523 | (1.7) | 439 | (2.9) | 55 | (3.0) | 514 | (0.6) | 422 | (1.3) | 90 | (1.3) |
| 茲 | Brazil | 385 | (5.4) | 292 | (5.4) |  | (6.9) | 389 | (5.1) | 317 | (4.6) | 72 | (6.0) | 410 | (5.2) | 395 | (13.1) |  | (14.3) | 384 | (5.2) | 307 | (4.2) | 77 | (5.4) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 563 | (4.4) | 483 | (5.2) |  | (5.2) | 561 | (4.3) | 492 | (10.7) | 69 | (9.5) | 577 | (4.4) | C | c | C | c | 564 | (4.4) | 488 | (5.3) | 76 | (4.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 370 | (4.1) | 314 | (4.4) | 57 | (5.5) | 376 | (4.3) | 324 | (13.1) | 51 | (12.6) | 404 | (8.3) | C | c | C | c | 370 | (4.1) | 315 | (4.4) | 55 | (5.4) |
|  | Latvia | 491 | (3.8) | 390 | (6.5) | 101 | (7.5) | 491 | (3.8) | 404 | (13.9) | 87 | (14.0) | 533 | (7.6) | C | c | C | c | 491 | (3.8) | 394 | (6.1) | 97 | (7.0) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 546 | (5.2) | C | c | C | c | 542 | (5.1) | 514 | (12.1) | 27 | (13.6) | C | c | C | c | C | c | 546 | (5.3) | 490 | (10.0) | 56 | (11.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 556 | (3.7) | 483 | (5.6) |  | (7.1) | 557 | (3.8) | 492 | (5.3) | 65 | (6.4) | 583 | (7.2) | C | c | C | c | 563 | (3.8) | 491 | (3.8) | 72 | (5.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 472 | (4.2) | 383 | (10.7) | 89 | (11.3) | 474 | (4.2) | 400 | (13.3) | 74 | (13.7) | C | c | c | c | c | c | 472 | (4.3) | 392 | (8.6) | 80 | (9.2) |
|  | Thailand | 418 | (3.0) | C | c | C |  | 419 | (3.0) | 378 | (14.1) | 41 | (14.1) | 443 | (4.3) | C | c | C | c | 419 | (3.0) | 366 | (13.4) | 53 | (13.8) |
|  | Tunisia | 412 | (4.4) | 315 | (1.9) | 98 | (4.6) | 403 | (4.1) | 328 | (3.1) | 74 | (4.8) | 426 | (4.8) | C | c | C | c | 417 | (4.7) | 324 | (2.1) | 93 | (5.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 452 | (3.1) | 329 | (3.4) | 123 | (4.8) | 454 | (2.9) | 354 | (2.9) | 100 | (3.8) | 467 | (3.0) | 434 | (12.4) | 32 | (13.3) | 460 | (2.9) | 348 | (2.4) | 112 | (3.6) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

[Part 2/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and grade repetition
Table IV.1.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by whether students repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary and upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) |  | Never |  | Once or more | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 510 | (1.7) | 454 | (3.5) | 56 | (3.8) | 510 | (1.7) | 439 | (8.5) | 71 | (8.3) | 511 | (1.7) | C C | C | c | 510 | (1.7) | 453 | (3.5) | 57 | (5.5) |
|  | Austria | 512 | (2.7) | 416 | (8.7) | 96 | (9.0) | 511 | (2.6) | 455 | (7.5) | 56 | (7.7) | 514 | (2.8) | 470 (7.2) | 44 | (7.5) | 514 | (2.8) | 447 | (5.4) | 67 | (9.0) |
|  | Belgium | 544 | (2.0) | 428 | (3.7) | 115 | (3.9) | 539 | (2.1) | 439 | (3.5) | 101 | (3.8) | 536 | (2.2) | 488 (4.0) | 48 | (4.0) | 554 | (2.0) | 449 | (2.9) | 105 | (4.0) |
|  | Canada | 525 | (1.9) | 441 | (4.8) | 84 | (4.8) | 525 | (1.9) | 452 | (3.9) | 73 | (4.3) | 524 | (1.9) | 447 (10.8) |  | (10.8) | 526 | (1.9) | 450 | (3.6) | 76 | (3.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 504 | (2.8) | 353 | (12.6) | 150 | (12.3) | 506 | (2.6) | 382 | (8.0) | 124 | (7.5) | c | c | C C | c | c | 506 | (2.7) | 372 | (7.2) | 134 | (9.4) |
|  | Denmark | 505 | (2.1) | 423 | (6.8) | 82 | (6.7) | 504 | (2.1) | 429 | (12.2) | 75 | (12.1) | 504 | (2.1) | C | C | c | 505 | (2.1) | 425 | (6.3) | 80 | (10.1) |
|  | Finland | 524 | (1.8) | 413 | (6.4) | 111 | (6.5) | 522 | (1.9) | 412 | (13.5) | 110 | (13.3) | C | c | C C | C | c | 524 | (1.8) | 412 | (6.3) | 112 | (6.8) |
|  | France | 524 | (2.8) | 386 | (4.3) | 138 | (4.6) | 521 | (2.7) | 425 | (4.5) | 95 | (4.9) | 519 | (2.6) | 435 (14.5) |  | (14.6) | 532 | (3.0) | 407 | (3.6) | 125 | (4.6) |
|  | Germany | 534 | (2.9) | 416 | (5.4) | 118 | (5.8) | 533 | (3.0) | 474 | (4.7) | 59 | (5.3) | c | c | C C | c | c | 535 | (3.0) | 450 | (4.3) | 85 | (4.9) |
|  | Greece | 458 | (2.5) | 338 | (11.4) | 120 | (11.8) | 459 | (2.4) | 345 | (7.1) | 114 | (7.6) | C | c | C C | C | c | 458 | (2.4) | 346 | (6.3) | 112 | (7.4) |
|  | Hungary | 487 | (3.4) | 358 | (9.3) | 128 | (10.2) | 486 | (3.3) | 388 | (10.5) |  | (11.2) | 489 | (3.5) | 411 (6.5) | 78 | (7.2) | 489 | (3.4) | 384 | (8.0) | 105 | (5.9) |
|  | Iceland | 495 | (1.7) | c | C | C | C | 495 | (1.7) | c | C | C | C | C | C | C C | C | C | 495 | (1.7) | 430 | (15.9) | 65 | c |
|  | Ireland | 506 | (2.2) | 456 | (4.6) | 51 | (4.3) | 506 | (2.2) | 435 | (15.1) |  | (14.9) | 508 | (2.3) | C C | C | c | 506 | (2.2) | 455 | (4.8) | 52 | (4.4) |
|  | Italy | 496 | (2.0) | 392 | (7.9) | 104 | (7.8) | 498 | (2.0) | 395 | (3.4) | 103 | (3.9) | 498 | (2.0) | $437 \quad$ (2.9) | 61 | (3.0) | 500 | (2.0) | 420 | (2.3) | 80 | (5.5) |
|  | Japan | c | c | c |  | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | C C | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | C |
|  | Korea | 555 | (4.5) | 530 | (9.3) | 25 | (7.9) | 556 | (4.5) | 530 | (10.0) | 25 | (8.7) | 556 | (4.7) | 532 (11.2) |  | (10.3) | 555 | (4.5) | 526 | (9.9) | 29 | c |
|  | Luxembourg | 517 | (1.2) | 405 | (2.5) | 112 | (2.7) | 511 | (1.3) | 444 | (2.4) | 67 | (2.7) | 506 | (1.3) | 409 (10.9) |  | (11.2) | 525 | (1.3) | 426 | (1.8) | 98 | (2.5) |
|  | Mexico | 424 | (1.3) | 351 | (2.1) | 73 | (2.4) | 422 | (1.3) | 374 | (4.4) | 48 | (4.6) | 429 | (1.5) | 378 (5.7) | 50 | (5.7) | 424 | (1.4) | 358 | (2.0) | 66 | (4.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 541 | (3.2) | 459 | (5.1) | 82 | (5.3) | 529 | (3.5) | 518 | (6.9) |  | (6.9) | 531 | (3.5) | 487 (22.8) |  | (22.4) | 542 | (3.3) | 477 | (5.0) | 65 | (4.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 504 | (2.3) | 445 | (7.4) |  | (7.6) | 505 | (2.3) | 408 | (12.8) |  | (12.7) | 505 | (2.4) | 404 (18.9) | 101 | (19.3) | 505 | (2.3) | 444 | (6.4) | 61 | (8.2) |
|  | Norway | c | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | C | c | c | c | C C | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | C |
|  | Poland | 522 | (3.6) | 390 | (9.5) | 132 | (10.1) | 523 | (3.5) | 417 | (6.8) | 106 | (7.4) | c | c | C C | C | C | 522 | (3.6) | 411 | (6.4) | 112 | (8.5) |
|  | Portugal | 526 | (2.7) | 396 | (3.2) | 130 | (3.5) | 525 | (2.9) | 421 | (3.6) | 103 | (4.0) | 533 | (2.9) | C C | C | c | 530 | (2.7) | 411 | (3.1) | 120 | (3.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 493 | (3.4) | 345 | (7.6) | 147 | (8.4) | 496 | (3.3) | 360 | (9.2) | 136 | (9.7) | 500 | (3.6) | C C | C | c | 493 | (3.4) | 352 | (6.5) | 141 | (11.1) |
|  | Spain | 506 | (1.7) | 392 | (2.3) | 114 | (2.0) | 514 | (1.7) | 419 | (2.0) |  | (1.9) | C | c | c | C | C | 519 | (1.7) | 417 | (1.8) | 102 | (3.2) |
|  | Sweden | 484 | (2.1) | 386 | (6.4) |  | (6.6) | 484 | (2.1) | 377 | (11.8) | 107 | (12.0) | 486 | (2.3) | C C | C | c | 485 | (2.1) | 380 | (5.6) | 104 | (11.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 547 | (3.0) | 440 | (3.3) | 107 | (4.3) | 542 | (3.1) | 500 | (4.3) | 42 | (5.1) | 543 | (3.3) | 496 (15.1) | 47 | (15.6) | 548 | (3.1) | 466 | (2.8) | 82 | (3.9) |
|  | Turkey | 459 | (5.0) | 348 | (7.5) | 112 | (9.3) | C | C | c | C | c | C | 464 | (5.3) | 383 (2.9) | 81 | (5.9) | 460 | (5.2) | 378 | (2.8) | 82 | (8.0) |
|  | United States | 493 | (3.4) | 419 | (5.1) | 74 | (5.2) | 491 | (3.5) | 431 | (7.3) | 59 | (7.1) | 491 | (3.5) | 444 (9.7) | 47 | (9.6) | 494 | (3.3) | 417 | (5.1) | 77 | (4.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 507 | (0.5) | 407 | (1.3) | 101 | (1.4) | 508 | (0.5) | 427 | (1.6) | 82 | (1.7) | 507 | (0.7) | 444 (3.1) | 63 | (3.2) | 509 | (0.5) | 421 | (1.1) | 89 | (1.3) |
| 气 | Brazil | 412 | (2.3) | 334 | (2.2) | 78 | (2.9) | 411 | (2.3) | 358 | (2.0) | 54 | (3.1) | 411 | (2.3) | 379 (2.9) | 32 | (3.2) | 415 | (2.4) | 353 | (1.6) | 63 | (5.4) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 571 | (3.2) | 496 | (5.6) | 75 | (5.2) | 569 | (3.2) | 503 | (7.8) |  | (8.0) | 567 | (3.3) | C C | c | C | 574 | (3.2) | 501 | (5.2) | 73 | (4.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 382 | (4.2) | 341 | (5.3) | 41 | (5.4) | 384 | (4.1) | 359 | (5.6) | 25 | (4.8) | 392 | (5.8) | 374 (12.4) | 18 | (9.8) | 382 | (4.1) | 341 | (5.3) | 41 | (5.4) |
|  | Latvia | 500 | (2.8) | 386 | (7.3) | 114 | (7.9) | 500 | (2.7) | 414 | (8.8) |  | (8.9) | 503 | (3.2) | C C | c | c | 500 | (2.8) | 397 | (6.4) | 103 | (7.0) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 544 | (4.2) | 461 | (17.0) | 83 | (17.9) | 545 | (4.3) | C | C | c | C | 548 | (4.9) | C C | C | c | 546 | (4.4) | 485 | (11.3) | 62 | (11.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 565 | (1.3) | 468 | (2.4) | 98 | (2.8) | 567 | (1.3) | 490 | (2.1) | 77 | (2.6) | 557 | (1.2) | C C | C | c | 576 | (1.4) | 486 | (1.6) | 90 | (5.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 485 | (2.9) | 387 | (12.9) | 98 | (12.6) | 486 | (2.9) | 408 | (14.4) | 78 | (14.6) | C | c | C C | C | c | 485 | (3.0) | 395 | (10.7) | 90 | (9.2) |
|  | Thailand | 428 | (3.4) | 398 | (13.4) | 30 | (12.3) | 428 | (3.4) | 392 | (11.4) | 37 | (11.5) | 431 | (3.7) | c c | c | c | 428 | (3.4) | 398 | (8.8) | 30 | (13.8) |
|  | Tunisia | 411 | (3.9) | 317 | (3.7) | 94 | (5.1) | 416 | (4.1) | 339 | (3.1) | 77 | (5.1) | 414 | (4.2) | 377 (8.3) | 37 | (8.4) | 422 | (4.2) | 336 | (2.9) | 86 | (5.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 441 | (2.7) | 330 | (3.3) | 111 | (3.8) | 443 | (2.8) | 357 | (3.0) | 86 | (3.5) | 443 | (2.6) | 338 (12.6) | 106 | (12.5) | 447 | (2.8) | 349 | (2.7) | 98 | (3.6) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[Part 3/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and grade repetition
Table IV.1.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics performance, by whether students repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary school |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary and upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Never |  | Once or more | Difference between never and once or more (never once or more) | Never |  | Once or more | Difference <br> between <br> never <br> and orne <br> or more <br> (never- <br> once or <br> more) | Never |  | Once or more |  | Difference <br> between <br> never <br> and orce <br> or more <br> (never - <br> (nce or <br> oncore) <br> more |  | Never |  | Once or more |  | Diffe <br> bete <br> ne <br> and <br> or n <br> (ne <br> once <br> mo | rence <br> ween <br> ver <br> once <br> more <br> or <br> re) |
|  | Score dif. | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered} \text { S.E. }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Score } \\ & \text { dif. } \quad \text { S.E. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Score } \\ & \text { dif. } \end{aligned} \text { S.E. }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered} \text { S.E. }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{array}$ | S.E. | Score dif | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| Q Australia | -22 | (3.3) | $\begin{array}{ll}-8 & (7.8)\end{array}$ | -14 (7.1) | -23 | (3.3) | -21 (12.4) | -2 (12.5) | -52 | (4.0) | c | c | c | c | -22 | (3.3) | -9 | (7.1) | -13 | (6.7) |
| Austria | -4 | (4.5) | 6 (14.8) | -10 (15.2) | -4 | (4.5) | -2 (13.6) | -2 (15.1) | -6 | (4.7) | -33 | (9.7) | 27 | (10.2) | -2 | (4.6) | -11 | (10.4) | 9 | (11.1) |
| Belgium | -20 | (3.5) | 10 (5.4) | -30 (5.2) | -17 | (3.6) | -34 (7.6) | 18 (7.6) | -24 | (3.7) | -14 | (6.3) | -10 | (6.4) | -15 | (3.4) | -6 | (5.1) | -9 | (5.5) |
| Canada | -20 | (3.1) | -1 (6.4) | -19 (6.5) | -20 | (3.1) | -7 (6.1) | -13 (5.3) | -27 | (3.2) | -17 | (14.0) | -10 | (12.7) | -20 | (3.1) | -3 | (5.2) | -17 | (5.1) |
| Czech Republic | -22 | (4.5) | -65 (17.4) | 42 (19.3) | -21 | (4.4) | -29 (17.8) | 8 (17.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -21 | (4.5) | -45 | (12.5) | 24 | (12.6) |
| Denmark | -15 | (3.9) | -4 (12.4) | -11 (10.8) | -17 | (3.9) | -17 (27.1) | 1 (28.1) | -81 | (18.8) | c | c | c | c | -15 | (3.9) | -5 | (12.1) | -10 | (10.7) |
| Finland | -24 | (3.2) | -19 (10.5) | -4 (9.5) | -25 | (3.3) | c c | c c | c | c | c | c | c | c | -24 | (3.2) | -26 | (9.6) | 3 | (8.2) |
| France | -15 | (4.1) | -31 (6.4) | 16 (6.2) | -25 | (4.3) | -37 (6.4) | 12 (6.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -22 | (4.5) | -42 | (5.7) | 21 | (5.9) |
| Germany | 7 | (4.7) | 9 (8.9) | -2 (10.0) | 7 | (5.0) | 0 (6.8) | $7 \quad$ (7.9) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 7 | (4.9) | 1 | (6.6) | 6 | (7.6) |
| Greece | 5 | (5.0) | -13 (18.8) | 18 (17.2) | 4 | (4.9) | -2 (10.7) | 6 (11.5) | c | c | c | c | C | c | 5 | (4.9) | -6 | (9.5) | 11 | (10.4) |
| Hungary | -12 | (4.9) | -29 (12.6) | 18 (14.3) | -12 | (4.8) | -18 (13.6) | 6 (13.7) | -14 | (5.0) | -51 | (10.2) | 37 | (9.9) | -10 | (4.9) | -33 | (9.8) |  | (11.1) |
| Iceland | -21 | (2.9) | c c | c c | -22 | (3.0) | c | c c | c |  | c | c | c | c | -21 | (3.0) | c |  | c |  |
| Ireland | -7 | (3.7) | 3 (6.8) | -10 (6.1) | -7 | (3.8) | 9 (22.7) | -16 (22.4) | -24 | (4.9) | c | c | c | c | -7 | (3.8) | 3 | (6.9) | -10 | (6.2) |
| Italy | 20 | (4.0) | 69 (26.8) | -50 (26.2) | 21 | (3.9) | 15 (10.1) | 6 (9.9) | 20 | (3.9) | 22 | (5.9) | -2 |  | 21 | (4.0) | 22 | (6.6) | -1 | (6.1) |
| Japan | c |  | C c | c c | c | c | c c | c c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Korea | 12 | (5.9) | c c | c c | 12 | (5.9) | c | c c | 13 | (6.0) | c | c | c |  | 12 | (5.9) | c | c | c | c |
| Luxembourg | 0 | (2.6) | -6 (4.7) | 6 (4.3) | -7 | (2.8) | -29 (3.9) | 23 (3.8) | -50 | (3.3) | c | c | c | c | 3 | (2.7) | -25 | (3.2) | 28 | (2.9) |
| Mexico | 16 | (4.1) | 26 (5.1) | -10 (4.5) | 13 | (4.0) | 11 (7.9) | 2 (7.3) | 0 | (3.1) | -21 | (12.0) | 20 | (11.8) | 16 | (4.1) | 22 | (5.0) | -6 | (4.4) |
| Netherlands | -20 | (4.6) | -24 (7.0) | 4 (6.7) | -26 | (4.9) | -10 (9.7) | -16 (8.9) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -20 | (4.7) | -20 | (6.9) | 0 | (6.0) |
| New Zealand | -25 | (3.7) | -17 (11.4) | -8 (11.7) | -25 | (3.7) | -27 (21.1) | 1 (19.4) | -29 | (3.8) | c | c | c | c | -25 | (3.7) |  | (10.5) | -17 | (10.2) |
| Norway | c | c | c c | c c | c | c | c c | c c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C |  |
| Poland |  | (4.6) | 44 (14.0) | -17 (14.9) | 28 | (4.6) | 44 (13.5) | -17 (13.5) | c |  | c | c | c | c | 26 | (4.6) |  | (11.1) | -22 | (11.6) |
| Portugal | 29 | (4.0) | 19 (4.9) | 10 (5.2) | 28 | (4.2) | 25 (5.5) | 3 (5.4) | 25 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | 30 | (4.0) | 19 | (4.7) | 11 | (4.6) |
| Slovak Republic | -10 | (5.0) | -7 (16.9) | -3 (17.3) | -8 | (4.9) | 5 (14.6) | -13 (15.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -9 | (5.0) |  | (12.8) |  | (13.4) |
| Spain | 13 | (3.5) | 17 (6.0) | -4 (6.2) | 8 | (3.6) | -6 (3.9) | 14 (3.5) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 7 | (3.6) | -3 | (3.8) | 10 | (3.3) |
| Sweden | -29 | (3.7) | -54 (13.4) | 25 (13.9) | -29 | (3.7) | -79 (24.7) | 50 (24.1) | -80 | (15.6) | c | c | c |  | -28 | (3.7) | -64 | (13.2) | 35 | (13.6) |
| Switzerland | 1 | (4.8) | 3 (5.3) | -2 (6.8) | -1 | (5.1) | -1 (7.0) | 0 (8.0) | -39 | (13.0) | c | c | c | c | 2 | (5.0) | 5 |  | -3 | (6.1) |
| Turkey | 21 | (8.9) | 25 (10.0) | -4 (11.9) | C |  | c c | c c | 14 | (9.3) | 5 | (5.5) | 9 | (9.2) | 21 | (9.1) | 23 | (6.0) | -2 | (9.5) |
| United States |  | (4.7) | 15 (7.7) | -17 (7.4) | -3 | (4.8) | 41 (10.2) | -44 (10.5) | -10 | (4.9) | c | c | c | c | -2 | (4.7) | 15 | (6.8) | -17 | (6.9) |
| OECD average 2003 | -4 | (0.9) | -1 (2.4) | -3 (2.4) | -7 | (0.8) | -7 (2.9) | 1 (2.9) | -21 | (1.9) | -16 | (3.6) | 10 | (3.7) | -4 | (0.9) | -6 | (1.7) | 2 | (1.7) |


| 茲 | Brazil | 27 | (6.2) | 42 (6.2) | -15 | (7.5) | 22 | (5.9) | 40 | (5.4) | -18 | (7.1) | 1 | (6.0) | -17 | (13.6) |  | (15.1) | 32 | (6.0) | 46 | (4.9) | -14 | (6.2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 8 | (5.8) | 13 (7.9) | -5 | (7.2) | 8 | (5.7) | 11 | (13.4) | -3 | (11.6) | -10 | (5.8) | c | c | c | c | 11 | (5.8) | 14 | (7.7) | -3 | (6.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 12 | (6.2) | 27 (7.1) | -15 | (7.2) | 8 | (6.3) | 35 | (14.4) | -26 | (13.9) | -11 | (10.4) | c | c | c | c | 12 | (6.1) | 26 | (7.1) | -15 | (6.9) |
|  | Latvia | 9 | (5.1) | -4 (10.0) | 13 | (9.9) | 9 | (5.0) | 10 | (16.6) |  | (15.4) | -30 | (8.4) | c | c | c | c | 9 | (5.1) | 3 | (9.1) | 6 | (8.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -2 | (7.0) | c c | c | c | 3 | (7.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0 | (7.1) | -5 | (15.2) | 5 | (18.4) |
|  | Macao-China | 10 | (4.4) | -16 (6.4) | 25 | (7.5) | 10 | (4.5) | -3 | (6.0) | 13 | (7.1) | -27 | (7.5) | c | c | c | c | 13 | (4.5) | -5 | (4.5) | 18 | (5.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 13 | (5.5) | 4 (16.8) | 9 | (17.6) | 12 | (5.4) | 8 | (19.7) |  | (22.7) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 13 | (5.6) | 3 | (13.8) | 10 | (14.3) |
|  | Thailand | 10 | (4.9) |  | c |  | 9 | (4.9) | 13 | (18.2) |  | (18.6) | -13 | (6.0) | c | c | c | c | 9 | (4.9) | 33 | (16.2) | -24 | (16.7) |
|  | Tunisia | -1 | (6.2) | 2 (4.6) | -3 | (7.2) | 13 | (6.1) | 10 | (4.8) |  | (6.6) | -12 | (6.6) | c | c | c | c | 5 | (6.6) | 12 | (4.1) | -7 | (7.0) |
|  | Uruguay | -11 | (4.5) | 0 (5.1) | -12 | (6.1) | -11 | (4.5) | 3 | (4.6) | -14 | (5.1) | -24 | (4.4) | -97 | (17.8) |  | (18.4) | -13 | (4.5) | 1 | (4.1) | -14 | (4.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 唡ilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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Table IV.1.23 Results based on students' self-reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink न्ञाड़ा http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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Table IV.1.23 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by students in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance, by students enrolled in: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grades below the modal grade |  | The modal grade |  | Grades above the modal grade |  | Performance difference (modal - below modal) |  | $\qquad$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Lower secondary } \\ \text { education } \\ \text { (ISCED 2) }\end{array}$ |  | Upper secondaryeducation(ISCED 3) |  | Performance difference (ISCED 3 ISCED 2) |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 467 | (5.2) | 503 | (1.9) | 528 | (2.7) | 36 | (5.3) | 25 | (3.0) | 499 | (1.8) | 529 | (2.7) | 30 | (3.2) |
|  | Austria | 482 | (3.2) | 528 | (3.1) | c | c | 46 | (3.9) | c | c | 405 | (9.8) | 512 | (2.6) | 106 | (9.4) |
|  | Belgium | 450 | (2.8) | 560 | (2.0) | 587 | (11.3) | 110 | (3.1) | 27 | (11.5) | 392 | (5.0) | 529 | (1.9) | 137 | (7.0) |
|  | Canada | 481 | (2.9) | 524 | (2.0) | 578 | (8.2) | 43 | (3.3) | 55 | (8.3) | 481 | (2.9) | 524 | (2.0) | 44 | (3.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | 368 | (7.5) | 491 | (3.7) | 523 | (3.7) | 123 | (7.2) | 31 | (5.1) | 480 | (4.1) | 523 | (3.7) | 44 | (6.3) |
|  | Denmark | 461 | (3.7) | 509 | (2.2) | 535 | (17.0) | 48 | (3.7) | 27 | (17.1) | 500 | (2.3) | 534 | (41.9) | 34 | (17.8) |
|  | Finland | 463 | (4.9) | 528 | (1.7) | c | c | 65 | (4.6) | c | c | 518 | (1.9) | c | c | c | c |
|  | France | 402 | (3.7) | 531 | (2.7) | 592 | (13.2) | 129 | (4.3) | 61 | (11.8) | 402 | (3.7) | 534 | (3.0) | 132 | (4.9) |
|  | Germany | 416 | (4.2) | 499 | (3.3) | 561 | (3.5) | 83 | (4.8) | 62 | (3.8) | 513 | (2.9) | 523 | (16.3) | 9 | (9.7) |
|  | Greece | 358 | (7.1) | 458 | (2.6) | c | c | 101 | (7.6) | c | c | 358 | (7.1) | 458 | (2.6) | 101 | (8.1) |
|  | Hungary | 389 | (8.5) | 480 | (3.6) | 517 | (4.1) | 91 | (9.5) | 37 | (3.3) | 389 | (8.5) | 489 | (3.5) | 99 | (7.6) |
|  | Iceland | c | c | 493 | (1.7) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 493 | (1.7) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 445 | (10.6) | 495 | (2.3) | 515 | (3.2) | 50 | (10.3) | 20 | (2.9) | 493 | (2.4) | 515 | (3.2) | 22 | (4.6) |
|  | Italy | 425 | (2.8) | 499 | (2.1) | 522 | (6.3) | 74 | (3.2) | 23 | (6.2) | 362 | (7.5) | 488 | (2.0) | 126 | (29.6) |
|  | Japan | c | c | 536 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 536 | (3.6) | c | c |
|  | Korea | 520 | (11.2) | 556 | (4.8) | c | c | 36 | (12.2) | c | c | 520 | (11.2) | 556 | (4.8) | 36 | (13.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 415 | (2.4) | 460 | (1.3) | 550 | (1.6) | 46 | (2.5) | 89 | (1.8) | 450 | (1.3) | 549 | (1.6) | 99 | (2.8) |
|  | Mexico | 385 | (2.6) | 429 | (1.8) | 455 | (6.9) | 44 | (3.5) | 26 | (7.2) | 385 | (2.6) | 430 | (1.8) | 45 | (6.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 436 | (8.4) | 495 | (4.1) | 556 | (3.5) | 59 | (9.5) | 62 | (3.9) | 488 | (3.4) | 605 | (3.3) | 116 | (4.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 455 | (7.1) | 501 | (2.3) | 536 | (9.4) | 46 | (7.2) | 36 | (9.5) | 455 | (7.1) | 503 | (2.3) | 48 | (6.3) |
|  | Norway | c | c | 490 | (2.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 489 | (2.7) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 411 | (5.7) | 522 | (3.4) | c | c | 111 | (6.2) | c | c | 517 | (3.4) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Portugal | 441 | (3.8) | 536 | (2.9) | c | c | 94 | (4.6) | c | c | 427 | (3.7) | 536 | (2.9) | 109 | (3.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 456 | (4.8) | 501 | (5.4) | 597 | (14.1) | 45 | (7.3) | 96 | (13.7) | 455 | (4.8) | 504 | (5.2) | 49 | (7.4) |
|  | Spain | 417 | (2.1) | 519 | (1.8) | c | c | 101 | (2.1) | c | c | 484 | (1.9) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Sweden | 372 | (5.7) | 480 | (2.2) | 564 | (13.8) | 109 | (6.1) | 84 | (14.1) | 476 | (2.2) | 564 | (14.0) | 88 | (16.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 444 | (3.9) | 530 | (2.6) | 578 | (6.1) | 86 | (4.3) | 47 | (6.5) | 515 | (2.8) | 584 | (5.9) | 69 | (14.2) |
|  | Turkey | 396 | (4.6) | 471 | (5.4) | 468 | (7.4) | 75 | (5.8) | -3 | (6.6) | 368 | (10.9) | 450 | (4.9) | 82 | (15.2) |
|  | United States | 406 | (5.6) | 487 | (3.5) | 509 | (5.0) | 81 | (5.9) | 22 | (4.1) | 406 | (5.6) | 492 | (3.4) | 86 | (3.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 429 | (1.1) | 504 | (0.6) | 541 | (2.0) | 74 | (1.2) | 44 | (2.0) | 454 | (1.0) | 519 | (2.1) | 74 | (2.3) |
|  | Brazil | 363 | (1.8) | 425 | (2.8) | 439 | (5.5) | 62 | (2.8) | 14 | (5.2) | 333 | (2.2) | 406 | (2.3) | 73 | (6.1) |
| \% | Hong Kong-China | 526 | (3.5) | 578 | (2.9) | c | c | 51 | (3.2) | c | c | 526 | (3.5) | 579 | (3.2) | 52 | (3.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 354 | (3.9) | 395 | (6.4) | 394 | (6.7) | 41 | (7.6) | -1 | (7.2) | 354 | (3.9) | 395 | (6.1) | 41 | (8.3) |
|  | Latvia | 425 | (4.6) | 502 | (2.8) | 556 | (9.1) | 77 | (4.8) | 54 | (9.0) | 488 | (2.7) | 543 | (11.0) | 55 | (6.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 459 | (10.0) | 542 | (4.7) | c | c | 83 | (11.2) | c | c | 522 | (4.2) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 500 | (1.3) | 584 | (1.5) | c | c | 83 | (2.0) | c | c | 500 | (1.3) | 584 | (1.5) | 84 | (7.6) |
|  | Russian Federation | 434 | (5.9) | 482 | (3.3) | 506 | (5.1) | 48 | (5.4) | 23 | (5.1) | 477 | (3.3) | 506 | (5.1) | 29 | (5.5) |
|  | Thailand | 416 | (6.8) | 428 | (3.7) | 461 | (11.7) | 12 | (7.1) | 32 | (11.8) | 416 | (6.8) | 430 | (3.6) | 13 | (4.4) |
|  | Tunisia | 332 | (3.0) | 419 | (4.3) | 443 | (5.9) | 87 | (5.4) | 25 | (4.9) | 332 | (3.0) | 421 | (4.2) | 89 | (4.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 352 | (4.5) | 449 | (2.8) | 501 | (10.7) | 96 | (5.1) | 52 | (11.1) | 352 | (4.5) | 450 | (2.7) | 97 | (4.2) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown StatLink (न्तोड्डL http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by students in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance, by students enrolled in: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grades below the modal grade |  | The modal grade |  | Grades above the modal grade |  | Performancedifference(modal - belowmodal) |  | Performancedifference(abovemodal - modal) |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Lower secondary } \\ \text { education } \\ \text { (ISCED 2) }\end{array}$ |  | Upper secondaryeducation (ISCED 3) |  | Performance difference (ISCED 3 ISCED 2) |  |
|  |  | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 3 | (7.1) | -19 | (3.7) | -32 | (4.4) | -22 | (7.1) | -13 | (4.3) | -17 | (3.5) | -31 | (4.4) | -14 | (4.4) |
|  | Austria | -9 | (5.3) | 8 | (5.7) | c | c | 17 | (6.2) | c | c | 7 | (13.5) | 0 | (4.4) | -7 | (14.6) |
|  | Belgium | 3 | (5.1) | -12 | (3.5) | -53 | (15.7) | -15 | (5.7) | -41 | (15.8) | 17 | (8.7) | -8 | (3.5) | -25 | (8.9) |
|  | Canada | 1 | (4.9) | -22 | (3.3) | -3 | (11.7) | -23 | (5.0) | 20 | (11.6) | 1 | (4.9) | -22 | (3.3) | -23 | (4.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | -128 | (9.4) | -44 | (5.7) | c | c | 84 | (10.4) | c | c | -15 | (7.0) | -13 | (5.7) | 1 | (7.5) |
|  | Denmark | 10 | (7.3) | -10 | (4.1) | -26 | (21.1) | -20 | (7.4) | -15 | (21.0) | -13 | (4.1) | -48 | (45.5) | -35 | (45.6) |
|  | Finland | -33 | (7.0) | -23 | (3.2) | c | c | 10 | (6.0) | c | c | -26 | (3.3) | c | c | c | c |
|  | France | -43 | (5.9) | -22 | (4.3) | -20 | (16.0) | 22 | (6.2) | 2 | (14.7) | -43 | (5.9) | -21 | (4.5) | 23 | (6.3) |
|  | Germany | 3 | (6.6) | -6 | (4.9) | -6 | (5.4) | -9 | (6.9) | 0 | (5.6) | 10 | (4.8) | 25 | (19.1) | 14 | (17.6) |
|  | Greece | -14 | (10.4) | 9 | (5.4) | c | c | 22 | (11.7) | c | c | -14 | (10.4) | 6 | (5.2) | 20 | (11.5) |
|  | Hungary | -3 | (11.3) | -6 | (5.2) | -4 | (5.8) | -3 | (12.1) | 2 | (4.3) | -3 | (11.3) | -8 | (5.0) | -5 | (12.0) |
|  | Iceland | c | c | -22 | (2.9) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -22 | (2.9) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 38 | (14.3) | 2 | (4.2) | -13 | (5.4) | -36 | (14.1) | -15 | (5.3) | 5 | (4.3) | -13 | (5.4) | -17 | (5.4) |
|  | Italy | 26 | (6.5) | 21 | (4.0) | 36 | (10.8) | -6 | (6.3) | 15 | (9.3) | 42 | (30.6) | 20 | (4.1) | -22 | (31.1) |
|  | Japan | c | c | 2 | (5.7) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 2 | (5.7) | c | c |
|  | Korea | -13 | (16.8) | 14 | (6.1) | c | c | 26 | (16.6) | c | c | -13 | (16.8) | 14 | (6.1) | 26 | (16.6) |
|  | Luxembourg | -29 | (4.4) | -14 | (2.8) | -4 | (3.4) | 16 | (4.5) | 9 | (3.5) | -17 | (2.6) | -5 | (3.4) | 12 | (3.5) |
|  | Mexico | 30 | (7.0) | 8 | (3.4) | -5 | (11.1) | -22 | (6.7) | -13 | (11.3) | 28 | (6.9) | 8 | (3.4) | -21 | (6.5) |
|  | Netherlands | -64 | (9.4) | -80 | (5.4) | c | c | -16 | (9.5) | c | c | -18 | (5.4) | -26 | (4.8) | -8 | (6.3) |
|  | New Zealand | -1 | (9.6) | -25 | (3.8) | -46 | (12.5) | -25 | (9.0) | -20 | (11.3) | -1 | (9.6) | -26 | (3.8) | -25 | (9.1) |
|  | Norway | c | c | -6 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | -6 | (4.1) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 45 | (11.1) | 27 | (4.5) | c | c | -18 | (11.0) | c | c | 27 | (4.6) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Portugal | 48 | (5.3) | 31 | (4.1) | c | c | -17 | (6.0) | c | c | 33 | (5.3) | 31 | (4.1) | -3 | (5.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -27 | (7.4) | -6 | (7.4) | -46 | (18.3) | 21 | (9.5) | -40 | (20.5) | -20 | (7.6) | -7 | (7.2) | 12 | (9.6) |
|  | Spain | -3 | (4.0) | 5 | (3.6) | c | c | 8 | (3.6) | c | c | -1 | (3.6) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Sweden | -34 | (10.5) | -29 | (3.7) | 2 | (22.1) | 6 | (10.3) | 30 | (22.2) | -30 | (3.7) | -1 | (21.4) | 29 | (21.5) |
|  | Switzerland | -4 | (6.1) | -5 | (4.7) | 7 | (13.4) | -1 | (5.3) | 12 | (13.9) | -2 | (4.7) | 8 | (16.2) | 9 | (15.6) |
|  | Turkey | 42 | (12.9) | 43 | (10.6) | 36 | (9.9) | 1 | (13.4) | -7 | (10.0) | 56 | (17.7) | 21 | (8.6) | -36 | (18.6) |
|  | United States | -45 | (7.2) | -10 | (5.0) | 2 | (9.0) | 36 | (6.8) | 11 | (8.7) | -45 | (7.2) | -6 | (4.9) | 39 | (6.7) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -8 | (1.7) | -7 | (0.9) | -10 | (3.1) | 1 | (1.8) | -4 | (3.1) | -3 | (1.8) | -4 | (2.5) | -2 | (3.3) |
|  | Brazil | 71 | (4.8) | 42 | (5.5) | 15 | (8.7) | -29 | (6.2) | -27 | (7.0) | 41 | (5.0) | 11 | (5.5) | -30 | (7.1) |
| $\stackrel{\text { TNㄹ }}{ }$ | Hong Kong-China | 11 | (6.3) | 2 | (5.8) | c | c | -8 | (4.7) | c | c | 11 | (6.3) | 4 | (5.9) | -7 | (4.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 41 | (6.5) | 46 | (7.6) | -2 | (10.4) | 5 | (8.7) | -48 | (11.2) | 14 | (5.7) | -1 | (10.0) | -15 | (10.2) |
|  | Latvia | -1 | (6.4) | 10 | (4.9) | 20 | (12.1) | 12 | (6.1) | 9 | (10.6) | 9 | (4.8) | 7 | (13.6) | -3 | (12.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -7 | (13.2) | -5 | (6.9) | c | c | 2 | (13.8) | c | c | -7 | (6.2) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 28 | (5.2) | 38 | (5.4) | c | c | 10 | (7.4) | c | c | -8 | (4.0) | 1 | (7.0) | 9 | (8.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | -9 | (7.3) | 3 | (6.8) | -22 | (15.0) | 11 | (7.9) | -24 | (14.1) | 34 | (5.4) | 25 | (7.9) | -9 | (7.6) |
|  | Thailand | 22 | (8.1) | -5 | (5.5) | -63 | (19.8) | -28 | (8.4) | -57 | (20.3) | 22 | (8.1) | -7 | (5.4) | -29 | (8.4) |
|  | Tunisia | 11 | (4.2) | -1 | (6.3) |  | (11.6) | -12 | (6.9) | 1 | (9.8) | 11 | (4.2) | 0 | (6.4) | -11 | (6.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 7 | (5.8) | -9 | (4.5) | 12 | (12.1) | -17 | (6.4) | 22 | (12.5) | 7 | (5.8) | -12 | (4.4) | -19 | (6.4) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink ज्त्रोडाप http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
［Part 1／1］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and ability grouping in mathematics classes

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 <br> （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance，by use of ability grouping in mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance，by use of ability grouping in mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mathematics performance，by use of ability grouping in mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | sesspp awos doySu！dnos до шио әuO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean <br> score S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score <br> dif．S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S.E. | Score <br> dif．S．E． | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Score } \\ & \text { dif. S.E. } \end{aligned}$ | Score dif． | S.E. | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 529 （13．7） | 524 | （4．0） | 524 | （3．2） | 0 （5．7） | 538 | （28．5） | 502 | （2．9） | 506 | （2．5） | －3（4．3） | 9 （31．7） | －22 | （5．3） | －19 | （4．5） | －3 | （7．0） |
|  | Austria | 531 （3．5） | 461 | （12．8） | 437 | （5．8） | 83 （6．8） | 529 | （3．7） | 467 | （11．8） | 435 | （11．2） | 84 （11．2） | －2（5．4） | 6 | （17．6） | －2 | （12．7） | 1 | （12．6） |
|  | Belgium | 507 （7．7） | 540 | （4．8） | 543 | （8．1） | －15（10．1） | 521 | （9．1） | 522 | （4．8） | 497 | （10．4） | 25 （13．1） | 15 （12．0） | －18 | （7．1） | －46 | （13．3） | 40 | （16．9） |
|  | Canada | 522 （7．8） | 532 | （2．7） | 533 | （2．9） | －1（4．0） | 518 | （6．8） | 519 | （2．7） | 517 | （3．4） | 3 （4．5） | －4（10．5） | －13 | （4．3） | －16 | （4．8） | 4 | （6．0） |
|  | Czech Republic | 517 （5．1） | 525 | （7．0） | 493 | （12．2） | 27 （13．1） | 506 | （5．5） | 495 | （8．4） | 464 | （16．0） | 38 （17．3） | －11（7．7） | －30 | （11．1） | －29 | （20．2） | 12 | （20．2） |
|  | Denmark | 509 （4．7） | 517 | （5．1） | 517 | （4．9） | －5（5．8） | 505 | （4．7） | 497 | （3．2） | 508 | （8．1） | －9（8．5） | －4（6．9） | －21 | （6．3） | －9 | （9．6） | －4 | （10．1） |
|  | Finland | 544 （2．9） | 545 | （2．8） | 545 | （4．4） | －1（5．2） | 523 | （2．7） | 517 | （2．5） | 513 | （6．0） | 6 （5．9） | －21（4．4） | －28 | （4．3） | －32 | （7．7） | 7 | （8．1） |
|  | France | w w | w | w | w | w | w | 509 | （6．1） | 480 | （8．8） | 489 | （11．1） | 8 （13．7） | m m | m | m | m |  | m | m |
|  | Germany | 525 （6．3） | 497 | （11．8） | 464 | （8．2） | 53 （10．8） | 543 | （6．8） | 523 | （8．3） | 482 | （7．4） | 51 （9．1） | 18 （9．5） |  | （14．6） |  | （11．2） | －2 | （13．9） |
|  | Greece | 442 （4．6） | 458 | （14．6） | 437 | （16．4） | 8 （17．3） | 459 | （3．0） | 421 | （10．2） | 444 | （21．3） | 10 （22．6） | 16 （5．8） | －37 | （17．9） |  | （26．9） | 2 | （29．2） |
|  | Hungary | 474 （6．4） | 509 | （7．8） | 488 | （11．7） | 3 （14．9） | 470 | （8．5） | 499 | （10．6） | 467 | （6．2） | 20 （10．5） | －4（10．8） | －9 | （13．3） |  | （13．4） | 17 | （18．1） |
|  | Iceland | 505 （3．8） | 517 | （3．7） | 518 | （1．8） | －6（3．4） | 497 | （4．8） | 497 | （2．5） | 489 | （2．3） | 7 （3．1） | －9（6．4） | －20 | （4．9） | －28 | （3．5） | 14 | （4．9） |
|  | Ireland | 495 （19．2） | 502 | （6．1） | 504 | （3．4） | －3（7．2） | c |  | 498 | （4．5） | 506 | （3．9） | －8（6．6） | c c | －4 | （7．8） | 1 | （5．5） | －5 | （9．3） |
|  | Italy | 472 （6．7） | 480 | （5．8） | 435 | （8．6） | 42 （10．4） | 501 | （6．2） | 489 | （2．9） | 471 | （5．5） | 22 （6．6） | 28 （9．3） | 9 | （6．8） |  | （10．4） | －20 | （12．8） |
|  | Japan | 550 （7．0） | 514 | （9．2） | 519 | （14．8） | 18 （17．0） | 548 | （7．7） | 528 | （5．9） | 534 | （12．1） | 3 （13．4） | －2（10．6） |  | （11．1） | 15 | （19．2） | －15 | （21．5） |
|  | Korea | 535 （10．3） | 542 | （4．6） | 563 | （11．2） | －22（12．1） | 546 | （27．4） | 549 | （7．0） | 562 | （6．6） | －14（10．2） | 10 （29．3） | 6 | （8．6） | －1 | （13．1） | 9 | （16．4） |
|  | Luxembourg | 503 （1．5） | 503 | （1．8） | 460 | （2．6） | 43 （3．0） | 522 | （1．8） | 467 | （1．5） | 485 | （1．8） | 6 （1．9） | 19 （3．1） | －36 | （3．0） | 25 | （3．7） | －38 | （3．6） |
|  | Mexico | 386 （7．6） | 380 | （5．7） | 397 | （8．9） | －16（10．3） | 423 | （3．4） | 408 | （2．8） | 412 | （2．4） | 3 （3．3） | 37 （8．5） | 28 | （6．6） | 15 | （9．4） | 19 | （11．1） |
|  | Netherlands | 562 （25．5） | 537 | （10．9） | 533 | （5．8） | 10 （11．9） | 540 | （10．1） | 525 | （8．5） | 516 | （7．8） | 11 （12．3） | －22（27．4） | －12 | （14．0） | －16 | （10．0） | 1 | （17．5） |
|  | New Zealand | c c | 527 | （3．7） | 522 | （5．3） | 5 （7．6） | c |  | 503 | （3．4） | 496 | （5．8） | 8 （7．5） | c c | －24 | （5．4） | －27 | （8．1） | 4 | （10．2） |
|  | Norway | m m | m | m | m |  | m m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m m | m | m | m |  | m |  |
|  | Poland | 486 （6．5） | 490 | （4．5） | 492 | （3．9） | －3（5．8） | 513 | （5．1） | 511 | （7．0） | 524 | （7．9） | －11（9．2） | 27 （8．5） | 20 | （8．5） | 32 | （9．1） |  | （11．0） |
|  | Portugal | 484 （5．6） | 458 | （7．7） | 459 | （7．2） | 10 （10．0） | 513 | （5．2） | 466 | （5．9） | 477 | （9．1） | 13 （10．4） | 29 （7．9） | 8 | （9．9） |  | （11．7） | 3 | （15．5） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 524 （5．9） | 485 | （7．1） | 496 | （6．4） | 9 （9．2） | 493 | （9．0） | 487 | （7．6） | 464 | （9．6） | 26 （11．7） | －30（10．9） | 2 | （10．6） | －32 | （11．7） |  | （16．1） |
|  | Spain | 482 （14．1） | 484 | （3．8） | 486 | （4．8） | －2（6．2） | 496 | （7．4） | 486 | （3．4） | 481 | （2．6） | 7 （4．4） | 14 （16．0） | 2 | （5．4） | －5 | （5．8） | 9 | （7．4） |
|  | Sweden | 492 （14．7） | 509 | （4．2） | 510 | （3．8） | －4（5．9） | 472 | （6．6） | 479 | （5．8） | 480 | （3．1） | －3（5．9） | －20（16．2） | －30 | （7．4） | －31 | （5．3） | 0 | （7．5） |
|  | Switzerland | 573 （9．7） | 524 | （5．6） | 504 | （6．1） | $35 \quad(9.9)$ | 595 | （7．3） | 530 | （5．9） | 513 | （4．1） | $34 \quad(8.4)$ | 21 （12．3） | 6 | （8．4） | 9 | （7．6） | －1 | （13．8） |
|  | Turkey | 402 （7．9） | 413 | （9．5） | 445 | （13．4） | －36（15．5） | 483 | （14．5） | 438 | （6．3） | 437 | （9．3） | 18 （13．2） | 81 （16．7） | 26 | （11．5） |  | （16．5） | 53 | （21．0） |
|  | United States | 452 （21．9） | 485 | （4．9） | 488 | （5．3） | －4（7．4） | 457 | （12．5） | 481 | （5．0） | 489 | （7．3） | $-10 \quad(9.5)$ | 4 （25．3） | －4 | （7．3） | 1 | （9．2） |  | （13．4） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | $500 \quad$（2．1） | 498 | （1．4） | 493 | （1．6） | 8 （1．9） | 508 | （2．1） | 493 | （1．2） | 488 | （1．6） | 12 （1．9） | 8 （2．9） | －6 | （1．9） | －5 | （2．3） | 4 | （2．8） |
| $\stackrel{\text { ñ }}{\stackrel{4}{2}}$ | Brazil | 389 （10．5） | 360 | （11．9） | 342 | （7．8） | 31 （11．9） | 408 | （8．6） | 391 | （4．5） | 396 | （3．5） | 1 （6．2） | 19 （13．8） | 30 | （12．9） | 54 | （8．8） | －30 | （13．9） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 588 （13．6） | 556 | （5．7） | 509 | （13．8） | 52 （15．3） | 596 | （17．2） | 565 | （5．4） | 543 | （9．4） | 26 （12．3） | 8 （22．0） | 10 | （8．0） | 35 | （16．8） | －26 | （19．7） |
|  | Indonesia | 375 （5．7） | 365 | （10．9） | 352 | （6．9） | 19 （8．0） | 378 | （7．9） | 386 | （11．2） | 368 | （4．8） | 14 （8．5） | 4 （9．9） | 21 | （15．8） | 16 | （8．6） | －5 | （11．7） |
|  | Latvia | 474 （9．3） | 482 | （5．7） | 492 | （5．5） | －11（7．4） | 491 | （8．2） | 489 | （4．6） | 492 | （4．7） | －2（6．5） | 17 （12．5） | 7 | （7．6） | 0 | （7．5） |  | （10．7） |
|  | Liechtenstein | c c | 549 | （5．0） | c | c | c c |  |  | c | c | 508 | （6．0） | 50 （8．8） | c c | c | c | C | c | c |  |
|  | Macao－China | 525 （4．0） | 523 | （6．4） | 537 | （4．4） | －13（5．2） | 555 | （1．7） | 539 | （1．3） | 491 | （2．6） | 55 （2．8） | 30 （4．7） | 16 | （6．8） | －47 | （5．5） | 68 | （6．3） |
|  | Russian Federation | 442 （11．0） | 473 | （5．8） | 470 | （7．1） | －2（9．8） | 481 | （14．7） | 474 | （3．9） | 488 | （4．7） | －14（6．2） | 39 （18．5） | 1 | （7．3） | 19 | （8．7） | －13 | （12．6） |
|  | Thailand | 411 （7．7） | 427 | （5．9） | 412 | （5．1） | 9 （7．7） | 417 | （6．8） | 429 | （4．6） | 441 | （21．5） | －15（22．2） | 7 （10．4） | 2 | （7．7） | 28 | （22．2） | －24 | （22．7） |
|  | Tunisia | 359 （6．2） | 340 | （9．9） | 362 | （5．0） | －7（8．7） | 403 | （13．5） | 392 | （6．2） | 380 | （6．4） | 16 （9．1） | 44 （15．0） | 53 | （11．9） | 18 | （8．3） | 23 | （12．9） |
|  | Uruguay | 448 （8．4） | 418 | （5．8） | 406 | （9．9） | 21 （11．2） | 425 | （16．9） | 405 | （4．6） | 417 | （8．3） | －9（10．9） | －23（19．0） | －14 | （7．7） | 11 | （13．0） | －30 | （14．5） |
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Table IV.1.25 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  | PISA 2012 |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and student-teacher ratio |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and student-teacher ratio |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and student-teacher ratio |  |
|  |  | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 0.06 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.02) | -0.05 | (0.05) |
| ou | Austria | -0.14 | (0.03) | -0.07 | (0.04) | 0.07 | (0.05) |
|  | Belgium | 0.41 | (0.04) | 0.43 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.05) |
|  | Canada | 0.09 | (0.03) | 0.10 | (0.02) | 0.02 | (0.04) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.15 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.05) | 0.21 | (0.08) |
|  | Denmark | 0.12 | (0.03) | 0.07 | (0.05) | -0.05 | (0.06) |
|  | Finland | 0.06 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.03) |
|  | France | w | w | -0.10 | (0.05) | m | m |
|  | Germany | -0.06 | (0.09) | 0.14 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.10) |
|  | Greece | 0.15 | (0.04) | 0.12 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.06) |
|  | Hungary | 0.07 | (0.07) | 0.02 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.09) |
|  | Iceland | 0.03 | (0.02) | 0.04 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.03) |
|  | Ireland | 0.07 | (0.06) | 0.15 | (0.05) | 0.08 | (0.07) |
|  | Italy | 0.16 | (0.04) | 0.34 | (0.03) | 0.19 | (0.05) |
|  | Japan | 0.26 | (0.05) | 0.24 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.06) |
|  | Korea | 0.29 | (0.04) | 0.10 | (0.08) | -0.19 | (0.09) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.19 | (0.01) | 0.11 | (0.01) | -0.08 | (0.02) |
|  | Mexico | m | m | 0.03 | (0.02) | m | m |
|  | Netherlands | 0.46 | (0.05) | 0.41 | (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.10) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.16 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.05) |
|  | Norway | 0.00 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.05) |
|  | Poland | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.13 | (0.04) | 0.15 | (0.05) |
|  | Portugal | 0.04 | (0.04) | 0.23 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.05) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.13 | (0.04) | -0.05 | (0.05) | 0.08 | (0.07) |
|  | Spain | 0.14 | (0.03) | 0.07 | (0.05) | -0.07 | (0.06) |
|  | Sweden | 0.07 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.03) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.05 | (0.04) | 0.07 | (0.03) | 0.12 | (0.05) |
|  | Turkey | -0.19 | (0.06) | -0.29 | (0.04) | -0.10 | (0.08) |
|  | United States | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.05) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.08 | (0.01) | 0.09 | (0.01) | 0.02 | (0.01) |
| \% | Brazil | -0.22 | (0.05) | -0.15 | (0.02) | 0.08 | (0.06) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.37 | (0.06) | 0.34 | (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.08) |
|  | Indonesia | m | m | -0.04 | (0.06) | m | m |
|  | Latvia | 0.21 | (0.04) | 0.13 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.06) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.64 | (0.03) | 0.56 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.04) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.12 | (0.03) | 0.20 | (0.01) | 0.08 | (0.03) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.13 | (0.06) | 0.07 | (0.04) | 0.20 | (0.07) |
|  | Thailand | -0.08 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.06) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.36 | (0.06) | -0.07 | (0.02) | 0.29 | (0.06) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.08 | (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.03) | -0.11 | (0.06) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
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|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and students＇reports on the following： |  |  |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and students＇reports on the following： |  |  |  | Correlation between mathematics performance and students＇reports on the following： |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mathematics class periods per week （class periods） |  | Regular school lessons in mathematics per week（minutes） |  | Mathematics class periods per week （class periods） |  | Regular school lessons in mathematics per week（minutes） |  | Mathematics class periods per week （class periods） |  | Regular school lessons in mathematics per week（minutes） |  |
|  |  | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr．dif． | S．E． | Corr．dif． | S．E． |
|  | Australia | 0.10 | （0．02） | 0.11 | （0．02） | 0.11 | （0．02） | 0.09 | （0．01） | 0.01 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．02） |
|  | Austria | 0.01 | （0．03） | 0.02 | （0．03） | 0.02 | （0．04） | 0.01 | （0．04） | 0.00 | （0．05） | －0．01 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium | 0.38 | （0．03） | 0.37 | （0．03） | 0.31 | （0．01） | 0.21 | （0．03） | －0．06 | （0．03） | －0．17 | （0．04） |
|  | Canada | －0．02 | （0．01） | －0．01 | （0．02） | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.01 | （0．02） | 0.02 | （0．02） | 0.02 | （0．02） |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.14 | （0．03） | 0.14 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．04） | －0．09 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．05） |
|  | Denmark | －0．05 | （0．02） | －0．06 | （0．03） | －0．04 | （0．02） | －0．08 | （0．02） | 0.01 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．03） |
|  | Finland | 0.07 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．02） | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.03 | （0．02） | －0．03 | （0．03） | －0．04 | （0．03） |
|  | France | 0.06 | （0．02） | 0.06 | （0．02） | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.17 | （0．02） | 0.06 | （0．03） | 0.11 | （0．03） |
|  | Germany | －0．15 | （0．02） | －0．16 | （0．02） | －0．16 | （0．03） | －0．12 | （0．02） | 0.00 | （0．04） | 0.03 | （0．03） |
|  | Greece | 0.35 | （0．02） | 0.35 | （0．02） | 0.30 | （0．02） | 0.26 | （0．03） | －0．05 | （0．03） | －0．09 | （0．04） |
|  | Hungary | 0.01 | （0．03） | 0.01 | （0．03） | 0.06 | （0．04） | 0.07 | （0．04） | 0.05 | （0．05） | 0.06 | （0．05） |
|  | Iceland | －0．01 | （0．02） | －0．03 | （0．02） | 0.03 | （0．03） | －0．01 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．04） | 0.02 | （0．03） |
|  | Ireland | －0．01 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．02） | 0.03 | （0．02） | 0.02 | （0．02） | 0.05 | （0．03） | 0.03 | （0．03） |
|  | Italy | －0．03 | （0．02） | －0．02 | （0．03） | 0.17 | （0．02） | 0.14 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．03） | 0.16 | （0．04） |
|  | Japan | 0.28 | （0．04） | 0.31 | （0．03） | 0.42 | （0．02） | 0.45 | （0．02） | 0.14 | （0．04） | 0.14 | （0．04） |
|  | Korea | 0.11 | （0．03） | 0.12 | （0．03） | 0.27 | （0．05） | 0.27 | （0．05） | 0.16 | （0．06） | 0.15 | （0．06） |
|  | Luxembourg | －0．03 | （0．02） | －0．04 | （0．02） | 0.01 | （0．02） | －0．05 | （0．02） | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.00 | （0．02） |
|  | Mexico | －0．01 | （0．04） | 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.04 | （0．01） | 0.08 | （0．01） | 0.05 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．03） |
|  | Netherlands | 0.07 | （0．03） | 0.08 | （0．03） | 0.04 | （0．05） | －0．07 | （0．05） | －0．04 | （0．06） | －0．15 | （0．05） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.08 | （0．02） | 0.06 | （0．02） | 0.12 | （0．03） | 0.06 | （0．04） | 0.04 | （0．04） | 0.00 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | 0.01 | （0．02） | 0.01 | （0．02） | 0.01 | （0．03） | －0．04 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．03） | －0．05 | （0．03） |
|  | Poland | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.10 | （0．03） | 0.10 | （0．03） | 0.07 | （0．04） | 0.07 | （0．04） |
|  | Portugal | 0.11 | （0．03） | －0．01 | （0．03） | 0.09 | （0．04） | 0.10 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．05） |
|  | Slovak Republic | －0．03 | （0．03） | －0．03 | （0．03） | 0.06 | （0．04） | 0.06 | （0．04） | 0.10 | （0．05） | 0.10 | （0．05） |
|  | Spain | －0．01 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．02） | －0．06 | （0．02） | －0．07 | （0．02） | －0．05 | （0．03） | －0．06 | （0．03） |
|  | Sweden | －0．04 | （0．02） | －0．03 | （0．02） | －0．06 | （0．03） | －0．04 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．04） | －0．01 | （0．04） |
|  | Switzerland | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.00 | （0．02） | －0．11 | （0．02） | －0．13 | （0．02） | －0．11 | （0．03） | －0．12 | （0．03） |
|  | Turkey | 0.21 | （0．05） | 0.25 | （0．05） | 0.33 | （0．03） | 0.39 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．05） | 0.14 | （0．06） |
|  | United States | 0.18 | （0．03） | 0.16 | （0．02） | 0.17 | （0．04） | 0.16 | （0．03） | －0．01 | （0．05） | 0.00 | （0．03） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.06 | （0．00） | 0.06 | （0．00） | 0.09 | （0．01） | 0.07 | （0．01） | 0.02 | （0．01） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Brazil | －0．12 | （0．03） | －0．11 | （0．03） | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.17 | （0．03） | 0.14 | （0．04） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 0.16 | （0．03） | 0.16 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．04） | 0.00 | （0．03） | －0．10 | （0．05） | －0．16 | （0．04） |
|  | Indonesia | 0.19 | （0．03） | 0.14 | （0．03） | 0.22 | （0．04） | 0.14 | （0．03） | 0.03 | （0．05） | 0.00 | （0．04） |
|  | Latvia | 0.00 | （0．05） | 0.02 | （0．05） | 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.11 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.10 | （0．06） |
|  | Liechtenstein | －0．16 | （0．05） | －0．16 | （0．05） | －0．10 | （0．09） | －0．12 | （0．09） | 0.06 | （0．11） | 0.03 | （0．11） |
|  | Macao－China | 0.09 | （0．04） | 0.07 | （0．04） | 0.21 | （0．02） | 0.18 | （0．02） | 0.12 | （0．04） | 0.11 | （0．04） |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.20 | （0．03） | 0.20 | （0．03） | 0.23 | （0．03） | 0.22 | （0．03） | 0.03 | （0．04） | 0.02 | （0．04） |
|  | Thailand | 0.14 | （0．03） | 0.15 | （0．03） | 0.41 | （0．03） | 0.40 | （0．03） | 0.27 | （0．04） | 0.25 | （0．04） |
|  | Tunisia | －0．02 | （0．02） | －0．02 | （0．02） | －0．04 | （0．02） | 0.09 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．03） | 0.11 | （0．03） |
|  | Uruguay | －0．01 | （0．03） | －0．06 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.09 | （0．03） | 0.15 | （0．04） | 0.15 | （0．04） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 司页解 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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|  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics performance，by students who reported that they had attended pre－primary education（ISCED 0） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA index of economic，social and cultural status，by students who reported that they had attended pre－primary education（ISCED 0） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No attendance |  | For one year or less |  | For more than one year |  | Performance difference （more than one year or one year or less－no attendance） |  | Performance difference （more than one year－ one year or less or no attendance） |  | No attendance |  | For one year or less |  | For more than one year |  | Mean index difference （more than one year or one year or less－no attendance） |  | Mean index difference （more than one year－ one year or less or no attendance） |  |
|  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean dif． | S．E． | Mean dif． | S．E． |
| Q Australia | 462 | （5．1） | 499 | （1．8） | 515 | （2．0） | 46 | （5．2） | 20 | （2．0） | －0．12 | （0．05） | 0.16 | （0．01） | 0.36 | （0．01） | 0.39 | （0．05） | 0.23 | （0．02） |
| ${ }^{0}$ Austria | 447 | （14．3） | 482 | （5．9） | 510 | （2．6） | 59 | （14．1） | 33 | （6．0） | －0．76 | （0．17） | －0．19 | （0．05） | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.85 | （0．17） | 0.40 | （0．06） |
| Belgium | 448 | （9．3） | 455 | （6．6） | 521 | （2．1） | 70 | （9．2） | 68 | （5．7） | －0．44 | （0．09） | －0．20 | （0．09） | 0.18 | （0．02） | 0.61 | （0．08） | 0.46 | （0．08） |
| Canada | 499 | （3．3） | 512 | （1．8） | 532 | （2．6） | 24 | （3．2） | 23 | （2．4） | 0.12 | （0．03） | 0.33 | （0．02） | 0.54 | （0．02） | 0.32 | （0．03） | 0.25 | （0．02） |
| Czech Republic | 434 | （15．1） | 482 | （7．1） | 504 | （2．7） | 67 | （15．0） | 34 | （7．3） | －0．40 | （0．13） | －0．16 | （0．05） | －0．04 | （0．02） | 0.34 | （0．13） | 0.18 | （0．05） |
| Denmark | 442 | （10．9） | 468 | （3．3） | 510 | （2．2） | 60 | （10．4） | 44 | （3．0） | －0．03 | （0．13） | 0.25 | （0．04） | 0.48 | （0．02） | 0.46 | （0．12） | 0.24 | （0．03） |
| Finland | 471 | （10．6） | 512 | （2．6） | 527 | （2．2） | 50 | （10．4） | 18 | （3．3） | －0．13 | （0．12） | 0.22 | （0．02） | 0.46 | （0．02） | 0.50 | （0．12） | 0.26 | （0．02） |
| France | 403 | （13．1） | 437 | （5．6） | 503 | （2．5） | 96 | （13．0） | 73 | （5．6） | －0．73 | （0．10） | －0．27 | （0．05） | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.71 | （0．10） | 0.37 | （0．05） |
| Germany | 466 | （8．2） | 465 | （4．7） | 528 | （3．1） | 55 | （7．8） | 62 | （4．7） | －0．11 | （0．08） | －0．15 | （0．06） | 0.26 | （0．02） | 0.32 | （0．08） | 0.40 | （0．05） |
| Greece | 395 | （7．9） | 439 | （3．9） | 463 | （2．5） | 61 | （7．8） | 30 | （3．7） | －0．79 | （0．09） | －0．15 | （0．04） | 0.02 | （0．03） | 0.76 | （0．09） | 0.26 | （0．04） |
| Hungary | c | c | 432 | （10．1） | 480 | （3．2） | c | c | 48 | （9．3） | c | c | －0．46 | （0．11） | －0．25 | （0．03） | c | c | 0.14 | （0．09） |
| Iceland | 449 | （12．0） | 463 | （9．4） | 496 | （1．7） | 47 | （12．3） | 39 | （7．0） | 0.10 | （0．13） | 0.49 | （0．10） | 0.81 | （0．01） | 0.69 | （0．13） | 0.47 | （0．07） |
| Ireland | 491 | （4．2） | 506 | （2．8） | 502 | （2．7） | 13 | （4．0） | 0 | （3．0） | －0．17 | （0．04） | 0.09 | （0．02） | 0.26 | （0．03） | 0.35 | （0．04） | 0.23 | （0．02） |
| Italy | 429 | （4．5） | 454 | （3．3） | 492 | （2．1） | 60 | （4．5） | 46 | （2．9） | －0．41 | （0．05） | －0．14 | （0．03） | －0．03 | （0．02） | 0.37 | （0．04） | 0.21 | （0．03） |
| Japan | 502 | （18．2） | 484 | （8．5） | 540 | （3．6） | 36 | （17．2） | 50 | （7．6） | －0．06 | （0．13） | －0．33 | （0．06） | －0．07 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．13） | 0.19 | （0．06） |
| Korea | 533 | （8．6） | 541 | （6．9） | 557 | （4．5） | 22 | （8．0） | 18 | （5．1） | －0．24 | （0．06） | －0．06 | （0．03） | 0.04 | （0．03） | 0.27 | （0．06） | 0.15 | （0．03） |
| Luxembourg | 451 | （6．4） | 454 | （4．0） | 498 | （1．4） | 42 | （6．7） | 45 | （3．8） | －0．42 | （0．08） | －0．13 | （0．05） | 0.14 | （0．02） | 0.52 | （0．08） | 0.34 | （0．04） |
| Mexico | 378 | （2．5） | 411 | （1．8） | 419 | （1．4） | 40 | （2．4） | 19 | （1．6） | －1．81 | （0．04） | －1．31 | （0．03） | －0．96 | （0．03） | 0.78 | （0．04） | 0.52 | （0．03） |
| Netherlands | 484 | （12．1） | 522 | （10．1） | 525 | （3．5） | 41 | （11．5） | 21 | （8．1） | －0．10 | （0．16） | 0.13 | （0．07） | 0.25 | （0．02） | 0.34 | （0．16） | 0.22 | （0．08） |
| New Zealand | 451 | （6．9） | 489 | （4．1） | 511 | （2．4） | 55 | （6．6） | 35 | （3．8） | －0．42 | （0．05） | －0．07 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．02） | 0.50 | （0．05） | 0.31 | （0．03） |
| Norway | 463 | （5．1） | 459 | （6．1） | 495 | （2．7） | 30 | （4．7） | 34 | （4．1） | 0.08 | （0．05） | 0.13 | （0．05） | 0.52 | （0．02） | 0.41 | （0．05） | 0.42 | （0．04） |
| Poland | 471 | （9．3） | 504 | （3．0） | 532 | （4．8） | 48 | （9．9） | 29 | （4．3） | －0．56 | （0．08） | －0．54 | （0．03） | 0.11 | （0．04） | 0.36 | （0．08） | 0.65 | （0．04） |
| Portugal | 461 | （5．0） | 465 | （5．0） | 504 | （4．0） | 34 | （4．8） | 41 | （3．9） | －0．93 | （0．05） | －0．73 | （0．06） | －0．30 | （0．06） | 0.53 | （0．06） | 0.51 | （0．05） |
| Slovak Republic | 390 | （8．0） | 462 | （6．2） | 494 | （3．5） | 99 | （8．8） | 56 | （6．4） | －0．98 | （0．09） | －0．49 | （0．05） | －0．06 | （0．02） | 0.86 | （0．09） | 0.60 | （0．06） |
| Spain | 435 | （3．2） | 455 | （3．9） | 492 | （1．8） | 54 | （3．0） | 46 | （2．8） | －0．64 | （0．04） | －0．42 | （0．04） | －0．13 | （0．03） | 0.48 | （0．04） | 0.38 | （0．03） |
| Sweden | 438 | （6．3） | 472 | （3．0） | 488 | （2．3） | 46 | （6．0） | 26 | （3．3） | －0．07 | （0．06） | 0.15 | （0．03） | 0.35 | （0．02） | 0.38 | （0．06） | 0.26 | （0．03） |
| Switzerland | 456 | （13．7） | 536 | （5．2） | 532 | （3．2） | 77 | （12．7） | 1 | （5．5） | －0．41 | （0．11） | 0.10 | （0．05） | 0.21 | （0．02） | 0.59 | （0．10） | 0.14 | （0．05） |
| Turkey | 433 | （4．4） | 480 | （6．0） | 495 | （10．0） | 51 | （5．9） | 51 | （8．7） | －1．77 | （0．03） | －0．91 | （0．05） | －0．30 | （0．08） | 1.03 | （0．05） | 1.27 | （0．08） |
| United States | 450 | （11．9） | 472 | （3．5） | 486 | （4．1） | 33 | （11．9） | 16 | （4．3） | －0．25 | （0．19） | －0．19 | （0．05） | 0.30 | （0．04） | 0.43 | （0．17） | 0.50 | （0．05） |
| OECD average 2003 | 451 | （1．8） | 476 | （1．0） | 505 | （0．6） | 51 | （1．8） | 35 | （1．0） | －0．44 | （0．02） | －0．17 | （0．01） | 0.12 | （0．01） | 0.51 | （0．02） | 0.36 | （0．01） |


| 亮 | Brazil | 368 | （2．4） | 386 | （2．0） | 408 | （2．8） | 31 | （2．6） | 28 | （2．3） | －1．57 | （0．03） | －1．24 | （0．03） | －0．94 | （0．03） | 0.51 | （0．03） | 0.42 | （0．03） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 483 | （15．5） | 502 | （8．2） | 566 | （3．1） | 81 | （15．3） | 70 | （7．9） | －1．30 | （0．11） | －1．17 | （0．08） | －0．77 | （0．05） | 0.51 | （0．11） | 0.44 | （0．07） |
|  | Indonesia | 351 | （3．7） | 390 | （4．5） | 405 | （9．2） | 45 | （6．4） | 38 | （9．1） | －2．19 | （0．04） | －1．56 | （0．07） | －1．34 | （0．11） | 0.72 | （0．07） | 0.60 | （0．11） |
|  | Latvia | 485 | （6．2） | 483 | （5．2） | 494 | （2．9） | 6 | （6．2） | 10 | （4．5） | －0．57 | （0．06） | －0．53 | （0．05） | －0．16 | （0．03） | 0.36 | （0．06） | 0.39 | （0．04） |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | 538 | （4．8） | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.29 | （0．06） | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao－China | 496 | （8．6） | 491 | （4．0） | 547 | （1．1） | 44 | （8．7） | 55 | （4．1） | －0．79 | （0．08） | －0．99 | （0．03） | －0．87 | （0．01） | －0．10 | （0．08） | 0.09 | （0．03） |
|  | Russian Federation | 461 | （4．6） | 464 | （4．9） | 491 | （3．0） | 26 | （4．0） | 29 | （2．9） | －0．47 | （0．04） | －0．22 | （0．04） | 0.01 | （0．02） | 0.45 | （0．04） | 0.39 | （0．03） |
|  | Thailand | 373 | （11．2） | 395 | （4．8） | 432 | （3．5） | 54 | （11．0） | 40 | （4．1） | －1．75 | （0．13） | －1．69 | （0．06） | －1．30 | （0．04） | 0.41 | （0．12） | 0.40 | （0．05） |
|  | Tunisia | 373 | （3．8） | 394 | （4．8） | 408 | （6．0） | 26 | （4．7） | 24 | （4．5） | －1．80 | （0．05） | －0．88 | （0．06） | －0．71 | （0．06） | 0.98 | （0．06） | 0.62 | （0．06） |
|  | Uruguay | 370 | （3．2） | 390 | （4．7） | 426 | （3．2） | 50 | （4．0） | 47 | （3．8） | －1．35 | （0．03） | －1．20 | （0．05） | －0．69 | （0．04） | 0.57 | （0．05） | 0.59 | （0．04） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 司页组 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

［Part 1／3］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and arriving late for school
Table IV．1．28 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance，by students＇reports on the number of times they had arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | None |  | One or two times |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  | Performance difference （none－one or more） |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
|  | Australia | 534 | （2．4） | 518 | （2．8） | 496 | （4．8） | 485 | （4．7） | 24 | （2．3） |
|  | Austria | 508 | （3．1） | 506 | （5．6） | 508 | （8．7） | 503 | （12．1） | 2 | （4．8） |
|  | Belgium | 549 | （2．2） | 510 | （3．9） | 468 | （8．2） | 444 | （10．2） | 54 | （4．3） |
|  | Canada | 546 | （1．9） | 533 | （2．2） | 513 | （3．6） | 501 | （4．0） | 22 | （2．0） |
|  | Czech Republic | 526 | （3．2） | 513 | （4．6） | 507 | （10．5） | 508 | （9．9） | 14 | （3．6） |
|  | Denmark | 525 | （2．6） | 508 | （4．0） | 501 | （6．6） | 487 | （6．3） | 22 | （3．4） |
|  | Finland | 554 | （2．5） | 536 | （2．5） | 532 | （4．5） | 518 | （4．9） | 22 | （2．9） |
|  | France | 522 | （2．8） | 504 | （3．6） | 477 | （7．2） | 438 | （8．8） | 29 | （3．9） |
|  | Germany | 516 | （3．2） | 501 | （5．9） | 479 | （12．1） | 476 | （12．7） | 22 | （4．6） |
|  | Greece | 450 | （4．1） | 445 | （5．1） | 439 | （5．1） | 432 | （7．2） | 9 | （3．7） |
|  | Hungary | 503 | （3．0） | 461 | （4．4） | 449 | （9．8） | 441 | （11．5） | 45 | （5．1） |
|  | Iceland | 526 | （2．0） | 510 | （2．9） | 511 | （4．6） | 468 | （7．1） | 22 | （3．0） |
|  | Ireland | 511 | （2．5） | 498 | （3．9） | 485 | （7．6） | 453 | （9．7） | 20 | （3．6） |
|  | Italy | 479 | （2．9） | 455 | （4．3） | 442 | （6．0） | 434 | （6．4） | 30 | （3．0） |
|  | Japan | 542 | （3．9） | 515 | （7．2） | 467 | （14．3） | 450 | （13．7） | 43 | （7．3） |
|  | Korea | 551 | （3．4） | 527 | （4．7） | 514 | （6．5） | 491 | （8．4） | 32 | （4．6） |
|  | Luxembourg | 494 | （1．6） | 496 | （2．6） | 489 | （5．9） | 482 | （6．7） | 1 | （3．1） |
|  | Mexico | 390 | （4．4） | 381 | （3．8） | 388 | （5．9） | 379 | （6．8） | 7 | （3．5） |
|  | Netherlands | 558 | （2．7） | 535 | （3．8） | 518 | （7．2） | 480 | （8．5） | 33 | （3．6） |
|  | New Zealand | 539 | （2．7） | 519 | （3．5） | 509 | （4．9） | 475 | （5．4） | 30 | （3．6） |
|  | Norway | 505 | （2．5） | 491 | （3．7） | 476 | （6．5） | 447 | （5．7） | 23 | （3．1） |
|  | Poland | 494 | （2．6） | 489 | （3．6） | 486 | （5．5） | 460 | （7．0） | 11 | （3．1） |
|  | Portugal | 465 | （4．0） | 469 | （4．0） | 471 | （5．3） | 451 | （6．8） | －2 | （3．6） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 503 | （3．2） | 487 | （5．3） | 469 | （7．8） | 481 | （14．5） | 19 | （3．5） |
|  | Spain | 498 | （2．7） | 475 | （3．1） | 463 | （5．2） | 450 | （5．9） | 29 | （2．8） |
|  | Sweden | 522 | （2．7） | 508 | （3．7） | 495 | （5．0） | 472 | （7．5） | 24 | （3．2） |
|  | Switzerland | 530 | （3．4） | 525 | （5．5） | 511 | （8．7） | 491 | （17．3） | 10 | （4．6） |
|  | Turkey | 431 | （7．0） | 408 | （7．7） | 392 | （9．9） | 402 | （13．9） | 26 | （5．0） |
|  | United States | 496 | （2．8） | 472 | （4．3） | 440 | （6．2） | 434 | （8．5） | 36 | （3．6） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 509 | （0．6） | 493 | （0．8） | 479 | （1．4） | 463 | （1．7） | 23 | （0．7） |
| Nì | Brazil | 361 | （5．2） | 356 | （4．6） | 349 | （10．0） | 334 | （9．2） | 9 | （4．0） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 559 | （4．6） | 521 | （6．4） | 473 | （13．4） | 446 | （18．0） | 50 | （5．3） |
|  | Indonesia | 368 | （4．0） | 352 | （4．7） | 345 | （6．8） | 333 | （9．2） | 18 | （3．4） |
|  | Latvia | 493 | （3．3） | 480 | （4．7） | 472 | （7．0） | 452 | （10．1） | 19 | （4．1） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 537 | （5．5） | 518 | （13．6） | c | c | c | c | 4 | （15．8） |
|  | Macao－China | 537 | （3．0） | 487 | （9．3） | 470 | （13．7） | c | c | 54 | （8．1） |
|  | Russian Federation | 478 | （4．2） | 460 | （5．4） | 449 | （6．4） | 438 | （7．9） | 23 | （3．7） |
|  | Thailand | 423 | （3．4） | 408 | （3．7） | 400 | （7．9） | 401 | （6．9） | 17 | （3．6） |
|  | Tunisia | 361 | （3．0） | 359 | （3．4） | 352 | （5．4） | 369 | （7．4） | 2 | （3．5） |
|  | Uruguay | 434 | （3．9） | 424 | （4．1） | 407 | （5．9） | 391 | （5．9） | 19 | （3．5） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 諢至收 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Table IV.1.28 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by students' reports on the number of times they had arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | None |  | One or two times |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  | Performance difference (none - one or more) |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 517 | (1.7) | 495 | (2.4) | 469 | (4.3) | 456 | (5.5) | 31 | (2.2) |
|  | Austria | 508 | (2.8) | 503 | (5.7) | 485 | (9.5) | 477 | (12.3) | 10 | (5.2) |
|  | Belgium | 526 | (2.2) | 499 | (3.8) | 466 | (7.2) | 437 | (8.5) | 38 | (3.5) |
|  | Canada | 534 | (1.8) | 510 | (2.5) | 491 | (3.4) | 471 | (4.5) | 33 | (2.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 508 | (3.0) | 481 | (4.1) | 467 | (12.3) | 447 | (12.2) | 32 | (3.6) |
|  | Denmark | 509 | (2.2) | 494 | (3.2) | 480 | (4.3) | 471 | (7.6) | 20 | (3.0) |
|  | Finland | 532 | (2.6) | 512 | (2.3) | 495 | (3.3) | 465 | (7.1) | 27 | (2.8) |
|  | France | 509 | (2.7) | 480 | (3.7) | 445 | (7.8) | 421 | (10.4) | 39 | (3.8) |
|  | Germany | 521 | (3.2) | 509 | (4.7) | 507 | (10.1) | 488 | (13.6) | 15 | (4.3) |
|  | Greece | 456 | (2.7) | 452 | (3.6) | 458 | (4.4) | 440 | (5.5) | 5 | (3.1) |
|  | Hungary | 490 | (3.0) | 443 | (6.6) | 446 | (12.7) | 409 | (11.7) | 50 | (6.4) |
|  | Iceland | 505 | (2.2) | 479 | (3.2) | 467 | (8.1) | 446 | (12.1) | 30 | (3.6) |
|  | Ireland | 510 | (1.9) | 485 | (3.7) | 474 | (7.4) | 450 | (9.4) | 30 | (3.3) |
|  | Italy | 497 | (2.2) | 472 | (2.3) | 456 | (4.4) | 436 | (5.1) | 31 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | 541 | (3.3) | 512 | (8.5) | 479 | (16.5) | 468 | (25.1) | 35 | (7.0) |
|  | Korea | 565 | (4.4) | 529 | (5.1) | 501 | (7.3) | 499 | (12.3) | 45 | (3.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 496 | (1.4) | 478 | (3.0) | 475 | (6.0) | 463 | (7.2) | 20 | (3.1) |
|  | Mexico | 418 | (1.6) | 408 | (1.5) | 406 | (2.5) | 397 | (4.7) | 10 | (1.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 535 | (3.5) | 509 | (4.7) | 477 | (9.8) | 461 | (9.4) | 35 | (4.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 520 | (2.6) | 486 | (3.3) | 464 | (5.7) | 440 | (6.4) | 44 | (3.7) |
|  | Norway | 502 | (2.8) | 472 | (4.8) | 456 | (6.5) | 420 | (9.3) | 38 | (3.7) |
|  | Poland | 525 | (3.6) | 517 | (4.6) | 499 | (6.1) | 476 | (6.2) | 17 | (3.6) |
|  | Portugal | 495 | (4.2) | 486 | (3.7) | 484 | (5.9) | 465 | (7.6) | 11 | (3.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 490 | (3.2) | 472 | (5.8) | 433 | (8.9) | 406 | (14.4) | 30 | (5.2) |
|  | Spain | 495 | (2.0) | 472 | (2.8) | 466 | (4.5) | 448 | (5.7) | 27 | (2.6) |
|  | Sweden | 497 | (2.7) | 477 | (2.8) | 460 | (4.0) | 438 | (5.6) | 30 | (3.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 533 | (3.0) | 530 | (4.7) | 512 | (9.2) | 503 | (10.8) | 7 | (3.7) |
|  | Turkey | 454 | (5.5) | 442 | (4.3) | 433 | (6.8) | 444 | (7.7) | 13 | (3.6) |
|  | United States | 494 | (3.5) | 465 | (4.4) | 427 | (7.0) | 427 | (7.9) | 39 | (3.5) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 506 | (0.5) | 485 | (0.8) | 468 | (1.4) | 451 | (1.9) | 27 | (0.7) |
| 茲 | Brazil | 394 | (2.3) | 391 | (2.5) | 388 | (4.6) | 372 | (4.5) | 5 | (2.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 569 | (3.1) | 533 | (5.8) | 494 | (15.2) | 469 | (22.7) | 43 | (4.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 379 | (4.3) | 365 | (4.0) | 369 | (11.1) | 358 | (9.6) | 14 | (3.6) |
|  | Latvia | 496 | (3.5) | 494 | (3.3) | 482 | (4.5) | 465 | (5.9) | 9 | (3.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 541 | (4.7) | 514 | (15.1) | c | c | , | c | 34 | (15.1) |
|  | Macao-China | 551 | (1.2) | 511 | (2.7) | 488 | (9.1) | 454 | (9.7) | 46 | (3.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 494 | (3.2) | 475 | (3.6) | 474 | (4.3) | 439 | (5.8) | 26 | (3.2) |
|  | Thailand | 434 | (3.9) | 417 | (3.7) | 411 | (6.2) | 391 | (6.6) | 21 | (3.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 391 | (4.5) | 388 | (4.3) | 382 | (4.9) | 383 | (7.5) | 5 | (3.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 415 | (3.9) | 410 | (2.8) | 412 | (4.7) | 385 | (5.4) | 8 | (3.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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Table IV．1．28 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance，by students＇reports on the number of times they had arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | None |  | One or two times |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  | Performance difference（none－one or more） |  |
|  |  | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
|  | Australia | －17 | （3．5） | －23 | （4．2） | －28 | （6．7） | －29 | （7．5） | 7 | （3．1） |
|  | Austria | 0 | （4．6） | －3 | （8．2） | －23 | （13．1） | －26 | （17．3） | 8 | （6．8） |
|  | Belgium | －22 | （3．7） | －11 | （5．8） | －1 | （11．1） | －7 | （13．4） | －16 | （6．0） |
|  | Canada | －12 | （3．3） | －24 | （3．9） | －22 | （5．4） | －30 | （6．3） | 11 | （2．8） |
|  | Czech Republic | －18 | （4．8） | －32 | （6．4） | －40 | （16．3） | －61 | （15．9） | 18 | （5．4） |
|  | Denmark | －16 | （3．9） | －14 | （5．4） | －21 | （8．2） | －16 | （10．1） | －2 | （4．0） |
|  | Finland | －23 | （4．1） | －23 | （3．9） | －37 | （5．9） | －53 | （8．8） | ， | （4．0） |
|  | France | －13 | （4．3） | －24 | （5．5） | －31 | （10．8） | －17 | （13．7） | 10 | （5．6） |
|  | Germany | 5 | （4．9） | 8 | （7．8） | 28 | （15．9） | 12 | （18．7） | －7 | （6．6） |
|  | Greece | 5 | （5．3） | 8 | （6．6） | 19 | （7．0） | 7 | （9．2） | －4 | （4．6） |
|  | Hungary | －13 | （4．7） | －18 | （8．2） | －3 | （16．1） | －33 | （16．5） | 4 | （7．7） |
|  | Iceland | －21 | （3．5） | －31 | （4．8） | －44 | （9．5） | －22 | （14．2） | 8 | （4．5） |
|  | Ireland | －1 | （3．7） | －13 | （5．7） | －12 | （10．8） | －3 | （13．7） | 10 | （4．4） |
|  | Italy | 17 | （4．1） | 17 | （5．2） | 14 | （7．7） | 2 | （8．4） | 1 | （3．7） |
|  | Japan | －1 | （5．5） | －3 | （11．3） | 12 | （21．9） | 18 | （28．6） | －8 | （10．4） |
|  | Korea | 14 | （5．9） | 2 | （7．2） | －13 | （9．9） | 8 | （15．0） | 13 | （5．6） |
|  | Luxembourg | 1 | （2．9） | －18 | （4．4） | －15 | （8．6） | －19 | （10．0） | 18 | （4．5） |
|  | Mexico | 28 | （5．1） | 27 | （4．5） | 18 | （6．7） | 18 | （8．5） | 3 | （3．8） |
|  | Netherlands | －23 | （4．8） | －26 | （6．4） | －40 | （12．3） | －19 | （12．8） | 2 | （5．7） |
|  | New Zealand | －19 | （4．2） | －33 | （5．2） | －45 | （7．8） | －36 | （8．6） | 14 | （5．3） |
|  | Norway | －3 | （4．2） | －19 | （6．3） | －20 | （9．4） | －27 | （11．1） | 15 | （4．5） |
|  | Poland | 30 | （4．9） | 28 | （6．2） | 13 | （8．5） | 15 | （9．6） | 6 | （5．1） |
|  | Portugal | 30 | （6．1） | 17 | （5．8） | 14 | （8．2） | 14 | （10．4） | 14 | （4．7） |
|  | Slovak Republic | －13 | （4．9） | －15 | （8．1） | －35 | （12．1） | －75 | （20．5） | 11 | （5．6） |
|  | Spain | －2 | （3．9） | －3 | （4．6） | 3 | （7．2） | －3 | （8．4） | －2 | （4．0） |
|  | Sweden | －25 | （4．3） | －31 | （5．0） | －35 | （6．7） | －34 | （9．5） | 6 | （4．8） |
|  | Switzerland | 3 | （4．9） | 5 | （7．5） | 1 | （12．8） | 13 | （20．5） | －3 | （5．8） |
|  | Turkey | 23 | （9．1） | 35 | （9．0） | 42 | （12．2） | 43 | （16．0） | －13 | （5．9） |
|  | United States | －2 | （4．9） | －6 | （6．5） | －13 | （9．6） | －7 | （11．7） | 3 | （5．4） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | －3 | （0．9） | －8 | （1．2） | －11 | （2．0） | －13 | （2．6） | 5 | （1．0） |
|  | Brazil | 32 | （6．0） | 35 | （5．6） | 38 | （11．2） | 38 | （10．4） | －4 | （4．4） |
| 离 | Hong Kong－China | 10 | （5．8） | 12 | （8．9） | 21 | （20．4） | 23 | （29．0） | －7 | （6．9） |
|  | Indonesia | 11 | （6．2） | 13 | （6．5） | 24 | （13．2） | 25 | （13．4） | －4 | （4．4） |
|  | Latvia | 3 | （5．2） | 14 | （6．1） | 10 | （8．5） | 13 | （11．8） | －10 | （5．0） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 4 | （7．4） | －5 | （20．5） | c | c | c | c | 29 | （22．8） |
|  | Macao－China | 13 | （3．8） | 24 | （9．9） | 18 | （16．6） | c | c | －8 | （8．2） |
|  | Russian Federation | 16 | （5．7） | 14 | （6．8） | 25 | （7．9） | 1 | （10．0） | 3 | （4．8） |
|  | Thailand | 11 | （5．5） | 9 | （5．5） | 11 | （10．2） | －10 | （9．8） | 4 | （4．8） |
|  | Tunisia | 30 | （5．8） | 29 | （5．8） | 30 | （7．5） | 13 | （10．7） | 3 | （4．7） |
|  | Uruguay | －19 | （5．8） | －14 | （5．3） | 5 | （7．8） | －6 | （8．2） | －11 | （5．0） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 部定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
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Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink (aitाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance, by schools where in the two weeks prior to the PISA test... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Over 50\% of students arrived late at least once |  | More than $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ but $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ or less of students arrived late at least once |  | More than 10\% but 25\% or less of students arrived late at least once |  | $10 \%$ of students or fewer arrived late at least once |  | Performance difference ( $25 \%$ or less - over $25 \%$ ) |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 488 | (4.9) | 504 | (2.3) | 514 | (3.8) | 520 | (10.0) | 15 | (4.3) |
|  | Austria | 507 | (26.4) | 493 | (8.2) | 521 | (8.3) | 500 | (7.7) | 15 | (10.8) |
|  | Belgium | 403 | (13.7) | 503 | (5.8) | 538 | (5.4) | 562 | (11.3) | 52 | (8.1) |
|  | Canada | 505 | (4.1) | 522 | (2.7) | 529 | (4.9) | 550 | (15.2) | 15 | (5.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 424 | (12.2) | 491 | (5.8) | 517 | (5.0) | 519 | (8.8) | 39 | (7.9) |
|  | Denmark | 490 | (6.8) | 498 | (2.9) | 514 | (4.9) | 510 | (12.2) | 18 | (5.9) |
|  | Finland | 512 | (2.9) | 522 | (2.6) | 522 | (5.5) | 527 | (31.9) | 4 | (5.3) |
|  | France | 415 | (10.9) | 493 | (5.4) | 531 | (6.5) | 506 | (12.8) | 51 | (8.1) |
|  | Germany | 484 | (30.0) | 509 | (6.4) | 522 | (6.2) | 511 | (10.4) | 13 | (9.8) |
|  | Greece | 454 | (4.9) | 454 | (5.2) | 439 | (31.4) | 416 | (25.2) | -25 | (21.9) |
|  | Hungary | 391 | (11.8) | 448 | (10.8) | 501 | (5.8) | 510 | (7.1) | 72 | (10.5) |
|  | Iceland | 469 | (4.8) | 496 | (2.0) | 498 | (3.3) | 497 | (8.0) | 6 | (3.3) |
|  | Ireland | 434 | (12.5) | 499 | (4.5) | 511 | (2.5) | 506 | (8.2) | 19 | (5.8) |
|  | Italy | 431 | (5.3) | 484 | (2.9) | 525 | (4.6) | 542 | (12.9) | 56 | (5.1) |
|  | Japan | c | c | 468 | (29.7) | 514 | (8.9) | 553 | (3.8) | 75 | (29.1) |
|  | Korea | 483 | (15.0) | 531 | (5.7) | 573 | (8.7) | 603 | (13.3) | 56 | (8.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | c | c | 492 | (1.6) | 493 | (1.3) | c | c | 5 | (1.9) |
|  | Mexico | 415 | (2.6) | 412 | (1.7) | 413 | (4.8) | 425 | (12.3) | 2 | (4.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 450 | (13.8) | 512 | (6.5) | 551 | (6.7) | 591 | (5.6) | 55 | (9.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 466 | (5.0) | 511 | (3.7) | 527 | (9.1) | c | c | 34 | (10.5) |
|  | Norway | 481 | (9.7) | 488 | (4.1) | 488 | (4.6) | 513 | (8.7) | 5 | (5.4) |
|  | Poland | 522 | (6.1) | 521 | (5.4) | 501 | (6.3) | 515 | (19.9) | -19 | (6.4) |
|  | Portugal | 484 | (4.8) | 493 | (7.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Slovak Republic | 419 | (16.4) | 469 | (7.9) | 497 | (7.3) | 508 | (11.3) | 37 | (11.5) |
|  | Spain | 474 | (5.8) | 485 | (2.7) | 488 | (4.0) | 506 | (9.5) | 8 | (4.8) |
|  | Sweden | 473 | (3.0) | 489 | (5.0) | c | c | c | c | 10 | (17.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 526 | (17.0) | 545 | (6.2) | 520 | (4.7) | 530 | (7.4) | -19 | (7.5) |
|  | Turkey | 418 | (8.8) | 451 | (6.3) | 530 | (24.3) | c | c | 87 | (24.3) |
|  | United States | 414 | (5.3) | 474 | (4.6) | 508 | (5.5) | 491 | (11.7) | 41 | (6.4) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 460 | (2.3) | 492 | (1.4) | 511 | (1.8) | 517 | (2.7) | 26 | (2.1) |
|  | Brazil | 394 | (8.1) | 387 | (3.3) | 397 | (4.6) | 402 | (11.7) | 10 | (5.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | c | c | 503 | (10.5) | 554 | (6.2) | 593 | (6.5) | 67 | (11.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 344 | (7.7) | 370 | (6.6) | 382 | (6.5) | 398 | (17.5) | 20 | (8.4) |
|  | Latvia | 487 | (3.1) | 498 | (5.5) | 504 | (18.0) | c | c | 9 | (16.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | 558 | (4.6) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 465 | (3.9) | 519 | (1.8) | 557 | (1.6) | c | c | 51 | (2.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 469 | (4.6) | 487 | (4.6) | 511 | (8.0) | 480 | (11.4) | 26 | (8.1) |
|  | Thailand | 394 | (5.0) | 428 | (5.7) | 442 | (7.1) | 457 | (17.0) | 28 | (7.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 387 | (5.0) | 390 | (7.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Uruguay | 408 | (3.4) | 403 | (9.5) | c | c | c | c | 101 | (25.7) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink aillst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384
［Part 3／3］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and concentration of students arriving late for school

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mathematics performance，by schools where in the two weeks prior to the PISA test．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Over $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ of students arrived late at least once |  | More than 25\％but 50\％ or less of students arrived late at least once |  | More than 10\％but 25\％ or less of students arrived late at least once |  | $10 \%$ of students or fewer arrived late at least once |  | Performance difference （ $25 \%$ or less－over $25 \%$ ） |  |
|  |  | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
|  | Australia | －14 | （9．5） | －24 | （4．2） | －11 | （7．6） | c | c | 13 | （8．4） |
|  | Austria | －1 | （34．0） | －20 | （11．3） | 7 | （10．6） | 10 | （11．1） | 23 | （13．9） |
|  | Belgium | －26 | （16．9） | －12 | （8．4） | －23 | （7．6） | －46 | （13．7） | －18 | （10．9） |
|  | Canada | －23 | （5．8） | －11 | （4．1） | －13 | （7．5） | 1 | （18．5） | 3 | （7．6） |
|  | Czech Republic | c | c | －21 | （9．3） | －8 | （7．5） | －25 | （13．5） | 22 | （12．6） |
|  | Denmark | －17 | （9．1） | －17 | （4．8） | －14 | （7．7） | －15 | （14．4） | 3 | （7．9） |
|  | Finland | －32 | （4．4） | －20 | （4．2） | －37 | （7．2） | －14 | （33．2） | －9 | （7．4） |
|  | France | －43 | （17．4） | －15 | （7．9） | －1 | （10．0） | －17 | （30．0） | 20 | （12．7） |
|  | Germany | 26 | （47．6） | 12 | （11．5） | 6 | （8．6） | －10 | （13．6） | －13 | （15．3） |
|  | Greece | 15 | （9．4） | 0 | （8．5） | 37 | （34．3） | c | c | 19 | （27．0） |
|  | Hungary | －8 | （18．4） | －24 | （12．2） | －13 | （10．5） | －30 | （10．0） | 8 | （13．7） |
|  | Iceland | －48 | （5．7） | －17 | （3．5） | －22 | （6．5） | －15 | （11．2） | 4 | （6．2） |
|  | Ireland | －50 | （16．8） | 4 | （6．6） | －2 | （4．8） | c | c | 0 | （8．7） |
|  | Italy | 15 | （8．5） | －7 | （5．6） | 24 | （16．5） | 69 | （29．6） | 19 | （16．0） |
|  | Japan | c | c | －15 | （33．3） | －25 | （12．1） | －6 | （8．3） | 3 | （34．0） |
|  | Korea | 4 | （25．6） | 5 | （8．9） | 18 | （11．2） | －4 | （18．9） | 13 | （14．5） |
|  | Luxembourg | c | c | －3 | （2．7） | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Mexico | 25 | （5．5） | 26 | （6．6） | 50 | （12．7） | 63 | （29．1） | 27 | （13．8） |
|  | Netherlands | －62 | （15．6） | －45 | （9．4） | －34 | （13．8） | c | c | 5 | （16．3） |
|  | New Zealand | －45 | （7．6） | －17 | （5．1） | －14 | （14．0） | c | c | 14 | （15．1） |
|  | Norway | －7 | （11．7） | －8 | （5．4） | －4 | （6．8） | －6 | （15．2） | 5 | （7．0） |
|  | Poland | 29 | （8．3） | 29 | （6．8） | 20 | （9．1） | 27 | （21．7） | －9 | （9．1） |
|  | Portugal | 15 | （7．0） | 33 | （10．9） | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Slovak Republic | 6 | （31．2） | －17 | （10．7） | －11 | （8．7） | －3 | （14．0） | 9 | （13．8） |
|  | Spain | 6 | （8．5） | －9 | （5．6） | －8 | （8．7） | 22 | （15．6） | －3 | （9．0） |
|  | Sweden | －30 | （5．7） | －27 | （6．1） | c | c | c | c | 16 | （18．7） |
|  | Switzerland | －1 | （27．4） | 15 | （10．0） | －3 | （8．6） | 3 | （13．2） | －15 | （11．5） |
|  | Turkey | 37 | （37．4） | 39 | （12．8） | 102 | （25．9） | c | c | 56 | （24．8） |
|  | United States | －40 | （8．3） | －7 | （7．1） | 5 | （7．7） | －11 | （13．7） | 11 | （8．3） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | －10 | （3．8） | －6 | （1．9） | 1 | （2．5） | 0 | （4．2） | 8 | （2．9） |
|  | Brazil | 51 | （13．4） | 31 | （7．7） | 26 | （12．0） | 54 | （25．9） | －6 | （12．9） |
| ： | Hong Kong－China | c | c | 15 | （14．6） | 1 | （10．5） | 4 | （11．1） | －19 | （14．5） |
|  | Indonesia | 18 | （11．6） | 5 | （8．2） | 11 | （11．8） | 16 | （52．6） | 5 | （14．3） |
|  | Latvia | 11 | （6．8） | 6 | （7．7） | 32 | （19．7） | c | c | 18 | （18．1） |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | 14 | （6．5） | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao－China | －14 | （8．1） | 28 | （7．8） | 26 | （4．3） | c | c | 3 | （7．0） |
|  | Russian Federation | 30 | （9．4） | 8 | （7．2） | 28 | （15．4） | 20 | （20．7） | 12 | （15．2） |
|  | Thailand | －8 | （8．8） | 16 | （7．5） | 12 | （10．9） | 25 | （24．6） | 6 | （12．0） |
|  | Tunisia | 23 | （11．8） | 32 | （8．7） | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Uruguay | 0 | （6．1） | －45 | （11．6） | c | c | c | c | 101 | （50．3） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 芴页能 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957384
[Part 1/1]
Primary school starting age
Table IV.2.1 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Age of entry into primary school |  |  |  | Percentage of students who started primary school at: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4 years old | 5 years old |  | 6 years old |  | 7 years old |  | 8 years old or older |  |
|  |  |  | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  |  |  | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.01) | 11.5 | (0.3) | 58.4 | (0.4) | 26.9 | (0.5) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Austria | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 4.2 | (0.4) | 73.6 | (0.9) | 20.8 | (0.8) | 1.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Belgium | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 18.9 | (0.6) | 70.3 | (0.6) | 8.3 | (0.4) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.98 | (0.03) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 49.9 | (0.7) | 27.5 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Chile | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.63 | (0.01) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 15.1 | (0.6) | 69.1 | (0.7) | 13.5 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 6.4 | (0.0) | 0.55 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.2) | 61.9 | (1.0) | 34.9 | (0.9) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 36.1 | (0.7) | 53.6 | (0.7) | 7.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Estonia | 6.9 | (0.0) | 0.44 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.1) | 15.3 | (0.6) | 80.3 | (0.6) | 3.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Finland | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.48 | (0.00) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 28.8 | (0.7) | 69.9 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.80 | (0.03) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 15.9 | (0.7) | 68.9 | (0.9) | 9.4 | (0.5) | 2.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Germany | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 70.1 | (0.8) | 24.0 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Greece | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.77 | (0.06) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 4.4 | (0.4) | 70.5 | (1.4) | 23.0 | (1.3) | 2.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Hungary | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (0.8) | 57.8 | (0.8) | 5.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.51 | (0.01) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 19.5 | (0.7) | 75.7 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 4.5 | (0.0) | 0.58 | (0.01) | 56.0 | (0.9) | 39.5 | (0.9) | 4.5 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Israel | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 5.8 | (0.5) | 70.0 | (1.2) | 23.4 | (1.3) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Italy | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.44 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 13.0 | (0.3) | 81.9 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.01) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 38.3 | (2.3) | 55.5 | (2.2) | 4.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 6.5 | (0.3) | 67.6 | (0.7) | 23.3 | (0.6) | 2.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.02) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 8.2 | (0.2) | 73.5 | (0.4) | 15.8 | (0.4) | 1.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 12.2 | (0.6) | 71.6 | (0.9) | 15.0 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.1 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.03) | 5.3 | (0.4) | 84.3 | (0.8) | 7.7 | (0.5) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.67 | (0.05) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 24.8 | (0.7) | 70.2 | (0.7) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 7.0 | (0.0) | 0.07 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Portugal | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.83 | (0.04) | 0.0 | c | 24.9 | (0.8) | 64.9 | (0.8) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 1.5 | (0.2) | 65.3 | (1.1) | 32.3 | (1.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Slovenia | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 8.2 | (0.6) | 60.8 | (0.9) | 30.1 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 25.4 | (0.7) | 70.4 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Sweden | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.05) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 25.3 | (1.3) | 70.2 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 6.5 | (0.0) | 1.03 | (0.03) | 2.8 | (0.4) | 6.4 | (0.4) | 44.2 | (0.9) | 41.4 | (0.9) | 5.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Turkey | 6.9 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 17.5 | (0.7) | 74.7 | (0.8) | 6.7 | (0.5) |
|  | United Kingdom | 5.0 | (0.0) | 0.63 | (0.01) | 19.9 | (1.5) | 64.2 | (1.6) | 14.6 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | United States | 5.9 | (0.0) | 1.05 | (0.07) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 24.5 | (0.8) | 57.5 | (0.9) | 12.6 | (0.6) | 1.9 | (0.2) |
|  | OECD average | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.00) | 3.7 | (0.1) | 16.2 | (0.1) | 51.1 | (0.2) | 27.1 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.0) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 6.4 | (0.0) | 0.75 | (0.04) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 61.9 | (1.1) | 32.2 | (1.0) | 3.8 | (0.4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { E }}{ }$ | Argentina | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 16.3 | (0.9) | 74.6 | (1.0) | 9.1 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c |
| ๔ | Brazil | 7.2 | (0.0) | 2.28 | (0.04) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 32.4 | (0.9) | 34.3 | (1.0) | 20.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Bulgaria | 6.9 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.04) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 13.4 | (0.6) | 82.8 | (0.7) | 3.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Colombia | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.80 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 27.5 | (0.9) | 52.0 | (0.9) | 16.4 | (0.8) | 4.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Costa Rica | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 2.9 | (0.3) | 40.6 | (1.4) | 54.6 | (1.3) | 1.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Croatia | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.1) | 34.5 | (0.8) | 63.9 | (0.8) | 1.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.02) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 7.6 | (0.5) | 76.1 | (0.7) | 14.4 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.02) | 0.0 | C | 11.1 | (0.6) | 73.3 | (1.0) | 13.3 | (0.7) | 2.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.65 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 8.3 | (0.9) | 54.5 | (1.4) | 35.3 | (1.6) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Jordan | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.64 | (0.02) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 9.1 | (0.5) | 78.8 | (0.9) | 9.6 | (0.5) | 1.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 6.5 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 3.3 | (0.4) | 42.5 | (1.6) | 52.0 | (1.7) | 2.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Latvia | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 1.8 | (0.4) | 25.0 | (0.9) | 69.4 | (1.0) | 3.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 6.6 | (0.1) | 1.16 | (0.21) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (1.2) | 43.6 | (3.0) | 46.5 | (2.9) | 5.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Lithuania | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.57 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 2.0 | (0.2) | 34.1 | (0.8) | 61.1 | (0.9) | 2.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 12.6 | (0.5) | 61.8 | (0.7) | 22.3 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Malaysia | 7.0 | (0.0) | 0.99 | (0.06) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 4.9 | (0.7) | 90.4 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Montenegro | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.00) | 0.0 | C | 0.7 | (0.1) | 39.1 | (0.6) | 60.3 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Peru | 6.1 | (0.0) | 1.29 | (0.06) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 17.4 | (0.6) | 60.8 | (0.9) | 15.3 | (0.7) | 4.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Qatar | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.86 | (0.01) | 10.0 | (0.3) | 19.5 | (0.4) | 51.8 | (0.5) | 18.7 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Romania | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.40 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 18.5 | (0.9) | 81.2 | (0.9) | 0.0 | C |
|  | Russian Federation | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 36.0 | (1.6) | 60.0 | (1.6) | 3.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Serbia | 6.9 | (0.0) | 0.36 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 12.3 | (0.6) | 85.9 | (0.6) | 1.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.82 | (0.01) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 31.0 | (0.9) | 51.1 | (0.9) | 13.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Singapore | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 23.2 | (0.7) | 71.8 | (0.8) | 2.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.67 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 3.0 | (0.2) | 26.5 | (0.9) | 59.1 | (0.9) | 11.4 | (0.5) |
|  | Thailand | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 4.4 | (0.5) | 76.5 | (1.1) | 18.9 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.03) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 13.6 | (0.5) | 81.7 | (0.7) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 6.0 | (0.0) | 1.08 | (0.04) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 23.6 | (0.6) | 54.1 | (0.7) | 15.7 | (0.5) | 3.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Uruguay | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 78.0 | (0.8) | 8.0 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Viet Nam | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.43 | (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 2.5 | (0.3) | 78.5 | (1.6) | 19.0 | (1.6) | 0.0 | c |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Grade repetition
Table IV.2.2 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 93.3 | (0.2) | 6.4 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 7.5 | (0.3) |
| نِ | Austria | 94.9 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 95.1 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 96.4 | (0.3) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 11.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Belgium | 79.5 | (0.7) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 83.3 | (0.6) | 15.5 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 90.9 | (0.4) | 9.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 36.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Canada | 95.8 | (0.2) | 3.9 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 95.6 | (0.2) | 3.8 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 8.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Chile | 87.4 | (0.9) | 9.9 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.5) | 92.9 | (0.6) | 5.9 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 89.1 | (0.7) | 10.5 | (0.7) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 25.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 97.9 | (0.4) | 1.9 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 96.7 | (0.4) | 3.0 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Denmark | 96.0 | (0.4) | 3.9 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Estonia | 98.0 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.2 | (0.3) | 1.6 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 96.8 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 3.8 | (0.4) |
|  | France | 83.0 | (0.7) | 16.5 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 85.6 | (0.7) | 13.9 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 28.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Germany | 89.8 | (0.6) | 9.6 | (0.6) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 87.2 | (0.6) | 12.3 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 20.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Greece | 98.5 | (0.3) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 96.1 | (0.7) | 2.8 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Hungary | 95.1 | (0.6) | 4.2 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 94.3 | (0.7) | 4.2 | (0.5) | 1.5 | (0.4) | 97.3 | (0.3) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 10.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Iceland | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 92.1 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.9 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 8.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Israel | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Italy | 99.0 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 92.6 | (0.3) | 6.1 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 89.7 | (0.4) | 10.2 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 17.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 96.8 | (0.2) | 2.4 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 96.9 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 97.8 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 78.5 | (0.5) | 19.3 | (0.5) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 80.7 | (0.6) | 18.5 | (0.6) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 34.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Mexico | 87.4 | (0.5) | 11.2 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 96.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 98.9 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 15.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 79.1 | (1.1) | 20.2 | (1.0) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 92.1 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 27.6 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 96.0 | (0.3) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.2 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 5.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Norway | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Poland | 98.6 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.8 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 4.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Portugal | 76.7 | (1.5) | 17.9 | (1.2) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 80.2 | (1.5) | 17.5 | (1.4) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 34.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 95.1 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 96.6 | (0.4) | 2.9 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 7.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Slovenia | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 97.1 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 3.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Spain | 86.2 | (0.5) | 12.9 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 72.3 | (0.7) | 25.0 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 32.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Sweden | 96.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | (1.1) | 4.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 86.8 | (0.7) | 12.7 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 91.9 | (0.5) | 7.9 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 19.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Turkey | 97.7 | (0.3) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 87.0 | (0.8) | 12.9 | (0.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 14.2 | (0.9) |
|  | United Kingdom | 98.0 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.2 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.3) |
|  | United States | 88.9 | (0.9) | 10.7 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.3) | 4.0 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 97.9 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.3 | (1.0) |
|  | OECD average | 92.9 | (0.1) | 6.4 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 94.3 | (0.1) | 5.2 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 97.9 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 12.4 | (0.1) |


| $\sim$ | Albania | 98.7 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 97.7 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{3}{5}$ | Argentina | 80.1 | (1.5) | 14.7 | (1.1) | 5.2 | (0.6) | 74.4 | (1.6) | 20.9 | (1.3) | 4.7 | (0.5) | 96.2 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.4) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 36.2 | (2.2) |
| ส | Brazil | 79.4 | (0.7) | 15.9 | (0.6) | 4.7 | (0.4) | 80.6 | (0.8) | 14.5 | (0.6) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 92.3 | (0.4) | 7.4 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 98.1 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.5 | (0.4) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Colombia | 77.6 | (0.9) | 18.4 | (0.8) | 4.0 | (0.4) | 71.3 | (1.2) | 22.0 | (0.9) | 6.7 | (0.5) | 94.5 | (0.5) | 5.3 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 40.6 | (1.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 83.6 | (1.2) | 13.0 | (0.9) | 3.4 | (0.4) | 74.5 | (1.5) | 20.3 | (1.1) | 5.2 | (0.6) | 99.6 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 33.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Croatia | 98.5 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | C | 98.2 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 97.7 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 2.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Cyprus* | 97.3 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 98.0 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 90.7 | (0.5) | 8.5 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 92.4 | (0.5) | 7.2 | (0.5) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 15.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 85.4 | (1.2) | 13.3 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 95.0 | (0.6) | 4.4 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 96.2 | (0.6) | 3.5 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 15.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Jordan | 95.1 | (0.4) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 94.2 | (0.4) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 7.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 98.9 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 1.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Latvia | 94.4 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 96.3 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.6) | 8.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 89.0 | (1.7) | 11.0 | (1.7) | 0.0 | c | 90.6 | (1.5) | 9.4 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | C | c | c | C | c | c | 18.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Lithuania | 98.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.9 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | C | C | c | C | c | c | 2.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 77.0 | (0.4) | 17.0 | (0.4) | 6.0 | (0.3) | 70.5 | (0.5) | 25.0 | (0.5) | 4.5 | (0.2) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 41.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Malaysia | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Montenegro | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 80.8 | (1.0) | 16.1 | (0.9) | 3.0 | (0.2) | 87.2 | (0.9) | 11.0 | (0.8) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 27.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Qatar | 91.2 | (0.3) | 7.4 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 93.8 | (0.2) | 5.0 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 96.5 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Romania | 97.0 | (0.3) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 97.3 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 98.3 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Serbia | 99.6 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 98.7 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 93.3 | (0.8) | 6.1 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 97.2 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 9.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Singapore | 97.3 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 98.5 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 97.7 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 5.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Thailand | 98.1 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 99.0 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 3.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 82.2 | (1.8) | 12.7 | (1.2) | 5.1 | (0.7) | 69.6 | (2.4) | 23.8 | (1.8) | 6.6 | (0.7) | 97.4 | (0.3) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 38.7 | (2.8) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 92.0 | (0.6) | 7.0 | (0.5) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 93.9 | (0.4) | 5.2 | (0.4) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 98.4 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 12.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Uruguay | 78.4 | (1.0) | 17.4 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.4) | 72.9 | (1.2) | 20.7 | (0.9) | 6.4 | (0.6) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 37.9 | (1.3) |
|  | Viet Nam | 96.8 | (0.7) | 2.9 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 94.5 | (1.2) | 5.1 | (1.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 7.7 | (1.5) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink 唡ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
[Part 1/1]
Relationship between grade repetition and students' socio-economic status
Table IV.2.3 Logistic regression after accounting for mathematics performance


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Logistic regression: Repeat = Intercept + variables listed in this table; where Repeat is equal to 0 if a student reported to have not repeated a grade and it is equal to 1 if a student reported to have repeated a grade.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (च्ञाsम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
[Part 1/1]
Student grade level
Table IV.2.4 Results based on students' self-reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (नाताsम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
[Part 1/1]
Table IV.2.5 Horizontal stratification of school systems


[^19][Part 1/1]
Programme orientation
Table IV.2.6 Results based on students' self-reports


[^20][Part 1/2]
School admissions policies
Table IV.2.7 Results based on school principals' reports


| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { n } \\ & \text { ¿ } \\ & \text { ¿ } \end{aligned}$ | Albania |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina |
|  | Brazil |
|  | Bulgaria |
|  | Colombia |
|  | Costa Rica |
|  | Croatia |
|  | Cyprus* |
|  | Hong Kong-China |
|  | Indonesia |
|  | Jordan |
|  | Kazakhstan |
|  | Latvia |
|  | Liechtenstein |
|  | Lithuania |
|  | Macao-China |
|  | Malaysia |
|  | Montenegro |
|  | Peru |
|  | Qatar |
|  | Romania |
|  | Russian Federation |
|  | Serbia |
|  | Shanghai-China |
|  | Singapore |
|  | Chinese Taipei |
|  | Thailand |
|  | Tunisia |
|  | United Arab Emirates |
|  | Uruguay |
|  | Viet Nam |




 28.3 (2.9) 29.9 (3.7) 25.7 (3.2) 28.8 (3.2) 33.3 (3.9) 37.9 (3.7) 49.2 (4.0) 34.1 (3.7) 16.7 (2.9) 56.7 (3.6) 19.6 (3.1) 23.7 (3.2)


 30.9 (4.1) 27.2 (3.5) 41.9 (3.7) 24.4 (3.4) 19.6 (2.8) 56.0 (3.4) 37.7 (3.8) 25.2 (3.6) 37.1 (3.8) 43.0 (3.9) 18.5 (3.0) 38.5 (3.9) 9.4 (2.1) 27.3 (3.6) 63.3 (3.3) 30.7 (3.2) 42.6 (3.6) 26.8 (3.1) 38.7 (3.1) 42.4 (3.4) 18.9 (2.8) 47.6 (2.8) 30.3 (3.0) 22.1 (2.6)


 71.1 (0.1) $22.9(0.1) ~ 6.0(0.0) ~ 4.1(0.0) ~ 27.2(0.1) ~ 68.8(0.1) ~ 9.5(0.0) ~ 45.4(0.1) ~ 45.1(0.1)|23.4(0.0)| 66.3(0.1) ~ 10.3$ (0.0)




 \begin{tabular}{llll|lllll|lllllll|ll|llllllll}
\& 42.3 \& $(3.9)$ \& 48.1 \& $(3.8)$ \& 9.6 \& $(2.3)$ \& 31.3 \& $(3.9)$ \& 38.0 \& $(4.0)$ \& 30.6 \& $(3.3)$ \& 47.8 \& $(3.8)$ \& 46.4 \& $(3.8)$ \& 5.7 \& $(1.8)$ \& 55.2 \& $(3.9)$ \& 34.3 \& $(3.5)$ \& 10.5 \& $(2.2)$

 30.4 (3.8) 23.1 (3.0) 46.5 (4.2) 54.1 (3.2) 31.0 (2.7) 15.0 (2.4) 49.1 (3.5) 40.4 (3.7) 10.5 (1.7) 17.3 (2.7) 43.9 (3.6) 38.8 (4.0) 

72.1 \& $(3.8)$ \& 24.7 \& $(3.7)$ \& 3.2 \& $(1.5)$ \& 5.3 \& $(1.9)$ \& 8.9 \& $(2.3)$ \& 85.8 \& $(2.6)$ \& 36.9 \& $(4.5)$ \& 49.6 \& $(4.7)$ \& 13.4 \& $(3.2)$ \& 57.1 \& $(4.4)$ \& 27.5 \& $(3.6)$ \& 15.4 \& $(3.3)$
\end{tabular} 36.6 (3.9) 33.6 (3.6) 29.8 (3.6) 20.8 (2.8) 32.8 (3.6) 46.4 (3.2) 22.0 (3.2) 62.4 (3.7) 15.6 (2.7) 14.4 (2.8) 42.8 (4.3) 42.8 (4.1)

 31.2 (3.9) 41.3 (3.5) 27.5 (3.2) 19.0 (2.1) 35.6 (3.3) 45.4 (3.2) 32.2 (3.6) 54.1 (3.8) 13.6 (2.6) 29.4 (3.5) 41.5 (4.1) 29.1 (3.8) 26.4 (3.5) 31.0 (3.7) 42.6 (3.6) 3.1 (1.3) 15.8 (2.2) 81.1 (2.4) 2.7 (1.3) 26.2 (3.0) 71.0 (3.3) 12.3 (2.3) 33.4 (3.7) 54.3 (3.8)

 49.7 (3.3) 23.6 (2.9) 26.7 (2.6) 65.7 (3.1) 8.4 (2.3) 25.9 (3.1) $66.2(3.3)$

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 2/2]
School admissions policies
Table IV.2.7 Results based on school principals' reports

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink 齐定L http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
[Part 1/3]
School admissions policies, by level of education
Table IV.2.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following factors are "always" considered for admission to school: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage <br> of students in schools whose principals reported that at least either "students' records of academic performance" <br> or "recommendations of feeder schools" is always considered for admission |  |
|  |  | Residence in a particular area |  | Students' academic records |  | Recommendations of feeder schools |  | Parents' endorsement of the instructional or religious philosophy of the school |  | Students' needs or desires for a special programme |  | Attendance of other family members at the school |  | Other |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 46.7 | (1.7) | 33.1 | (1.9) | 34.0 | (2.2) | 31.5 | (1.4) | 22.6 | (1.7) | 42.3 | (2.1) | 9.6 | (1.2) | 45.2 | (2.2) |
| U | Austria | 56.9 | (11.2) | 29.8 | (9.1) | 8.0 | (7.0) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 38.6 | (10.2) | 18.7 | (8.2) | 16.5 | (8.6) | 31.4 | (9.5) |
| O | Belgium | 10.6 | (6.0) | 29.0 | (5.4) | 5.0 | (2.8) | 40.9 | (5.6) | 24.3 | (7.5) | 24.4 | (4.9) | 20.8 | (6.3) | 29.2 | (5.3) |
|  | Canada | 58.0 | (3.9) | 29.0 | (3.7) | 24.5 | (3.9) | 9.7 | (2.3) | 24.1 | (3.4) | 16.2 | (3.2) | 15.5 | (5.7) | 40.1 | (4.0) |
|  | Chile | 18.6 | (7.2) | 6.1 | (2.7) | 6.4 | (2.9) | 7.0 | (2.8) | 7.2 | (5.0) | 27.2 | (7.4) | 9.3 | (5.9) | 10.4 | (3.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 23.7 | (3.5) | 18.7 | (2.5) | 9.6 | (3.4) | 16.6 | (3.9) | 29.5 | (5.0) | 4.1 | (1.8) | 4.6 | (1.7) | 25.0 | (3.4) |
|  | Denmark | 41.0 | (3.3) | 6.6 | (1.7) | 11.5 | (2.0) | 19.4 | (2.5) | 11.1 | (2.2) | 10.9 | (1.9) | 9.9 | (2.1) | 14.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Estonia | 52.2 | (3.0) | 36.7 | (2.6) | 4.0 | (1.2) | 11.0 | (1.8) | 25.2 | (2.4) | 18.8 | (2.1) | 5.4 | (1.3) | 38.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Finland | 67.0 | (3.4) | 2.9 | (1.0) | 2.7 | (0.8) | 5.8 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.9) | 6.1 | (1.6) | 4.2 | (1.3) | 3.4 | (1.0) |
|  | France | 72.9 | (3.5) | 16.7 | (3.1) | 2.2 | (1.5) | 14.0 | (2.2) | 9.2 | (3.1) | 19.4 | (4.6) | 7.5 | (3.2) | 16.7 | (3.1) |
|  | Germany | 48.6 | (3.6) | 49.2 | (3.7) | 45.4 | (3.9) | 9.6 | (1.9) | 34.9 | (3.9) | 19.8 | (2.9) | 5.8 | (2.1) | 62.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Greece | 68.9 | (11.1) | 0.0 | c | 8.4 | (6.8) | 12.0 | (7.6) | 3.5 | (3.3) | 8.1 | (4.8) | 6.8 | (6.2) | 8.4 | (6.8) |
|  | Hungary | 70.2 | (6.8) | 11.5 | (6.0) | 3.6 | (2.1) | 31.6 | (7.7) | 39.6 | (8.7) | 19.8 | (8.0) | 9.8 | (6.2) | 13.2 | (6.0) |
|  | Iceland | 48.1 | (0.2) | 8.1 | (0.2) | 19.2 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 2.3 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 21.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 44.5 | (4.0) | 21.7 | (3.5) | 24.5 | (3.7) | 25.7 | (3.4) | 16.9 | (3.0) | 53.9 | (3.6) | 19.6 | (3.5) | 26.5 | (3.8) |
|  | Israel | 47.6 | (6.3) | 25.0 | (4.7) | 29.7 | (5.1) | 27.9 | (4.7) | 14.2 | (3.6) | 7.9 | (2.8) | 7.4 | (3.9) | 36.3 | (5.6) |
|  | Italy | 46.1 | (7.5) | 67.1 | (7.6) | 64.5 | (7.5) | 45.1 | (6.8) | 34.4 | (5.4) | 39.6 | (6.9) | 18.6 | (5.0) | 74.8 | (7.6) |
|  | Japan | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | C | C | c | C | c | C | C |
|  | Korea | 22.1 | (12.0) | 21.5 | (12.2) | 9.5 | (3.4) | 5.4 | (5.3) | 11.9 | (8.2) | 22.4 | (11.6) | 0.0 | C | 24.5 | (11.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 47.2 | (0.2) | 73.2 | (0.1) | 10.0 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) | 17.3 | (0.1) | 50.7 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 73.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 15.0 | (2.3) | 27.1 | (3.1) | 8.6 | (1.5) | 18.3 | (3.1) | 8.8 | (2.4) | 14.7 | (2.5) | 7.9 | (2.7) | 30.7 | (3.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 19.1 | (3.8) | 92.5 | (2.3) | 92.3 | (2.6) | 28.2 | (4.0) | 22.0 | (3.4) | 18.9 | (3.5) | 4.6 | (2.5) | 98.4 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 45.4 | (3.9) | 51.6 | (4.5) | 50.4 | (4.5) | 24.6 | (3.7) | 26.0 | (4.6) | 39.3 | (5.0) | 22.1 | (5.3) | 56.8 | (4.5) |
|  | Norway | 63.3 | (4.0) | 6.7 | (2.0) | 4.4 | (1.6) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 2.1 | (1.1) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 6.7 | (2.0) |
|  | Poland | 76.8 | (3.1) | 17.0 | (2.8) | 4.5 | (1.6) | 3.5 | (1.1) | 15.2 | (2.5) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 18.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Portugal | 59.1 | (5.2) | 34.9 | (5.2) | 3.6 | (1.7) | 18.7 | (3.9) | 41.7 | (4.5) | 19.3 | (3.8) | 10.8 | (2.8) | 36.4 | (5.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 32.8 | (4.8) | 7.9 | (2.2) | 8.9 | (2.5) | 14.5 | (3.7) | 17.3 | (3.3) | 4.3 | (1.7) | 3.2 | (1.6) | 13.9 | (3.0) |
|  | Slovenia | 58.9 | (14.9) | 13.6 | (11.5) | 5.3 | (4.1) | 0.0 | C | 10.5 | (11.0) | 10.9 | (10.4) | 0.0 | c | 18.9 | (12.1) |
|  | Spain | 62.7 | (3.0) | 0.8 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (1.0) | 9.3 | (1.1) | 11.2 | (1.5) | 37.9 | (2.3) | 29.2 | (3.3) | 3.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Sweden | 51.2 | (3.6) | 5.7 | (1.9) | 7.0 | (1.9) | 3.9 | (1.4) | 10.5 | (2.5) | 12.4 | (1.8) | 10.6 | (2.5) | 8.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Switzerland | 59.0 | (3.5) | 60.3 | (3.6) | 56.0 | (3.5) | 2.9 | (1.1) | 16.0 | (2.9) | 1.4 | (0.6) | 6.5 | (1.8) | 72.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Turkey | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | United Kingdom | C | C | C | c | C | C | c | c | c | C | C | c | c | c | C | C |
|  | United States | 79.1 | (4.8) | 30.0 | (5.9) | 19.5 | (5.2) | 4.6 | (1.8) | 17.3 | (4.3) | 6.0 | (3.0) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 31.4 | (6.0) |
|  | OECD average | 48.8 | (1.1) | 26.9 | (0.9) | 18.9 | (0.6) | 14.5 | (0.7) | 18.3 | (0.9) | 18.8 | (0.8) | 9.1 | (0.7) | 32.0 | (0.9) |


| \% | Albania | 31.6 | (5.8) | 43.8 | (5.2) | 47.3 | (5.9) | 24.1 | (5.5) | 22.8 | (4.7) | 18.5 | (4.8) | 24.7 | (6.0) | 63.1 | (5.9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 30.8 | (5.1) | 5.1 | (1.8) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 19.7 | (4.2) | 16.5 | (3.5) | 32.7 | (4.7) | 15.5 | (4.3) | 7.9 | (2.2) |
| สิ | Brazil | 44.5 | (3.7) | 19.4 | (3.0) | 8.3 | (1.6) | 13.4 | (2.9) | 11.9 | (2.4) | 8.8 | (1.5) | 23.1 | (4.0) | 23.5 | (3.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 51.6 | (12.4) | 24.6 | (7.4) | 12.6 | (5.7) | 21.5 | (5.8) | 26.5 | (10.0) | 28.5 | (8.9) | 3.8 | (3.9) | 31.6 | (8.7) |
|  | Colombia | 24.0 | (3.0) | 35.8 | (3.6) | 17.2 | (2.9) | 20.2 | (2.9) | 9.8 | (2.4) | 22.4 | (3.5) | 17.6 | (3.7) | 42.0 | (4.0) |
|  | Costa Rica | 55.9 | (3.8) | 42.6 | (3.5) | 15.1 | (2.5) | 22.8 | (2.8) | 26.5 | (3.4) | 10.9 | (2.3) | 30.8 | (4.4) | 47.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Croatia | C | c | c | C | C | C | C | C | c | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
|  | Cyprus* | 81.9 | (0.8) | 16.2 | (1.2) | 17.5 | (1.0) | 9.1 | (0.7) | 11.5 | (0.7) | 14.2 | (1.1) | 10.6 | (1.0) | 26.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 16.0 | (3.2) | 90.7 | (2.4) | 28.7 | (3.7) | 29.0 | (3.5) | 7.7 | (2.4) | 18.5 | (3.3) | 51.5 | (9.8) | 93.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 45.1 | (5.6) | 48.7 | (4.8) | 46.8 | (4.8) | 47.8 | (5.2) | 35.2 | (5.4) | 25.5 | (4.5) | 10.3 | (3.7) | 67.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Jordan | 63.3 | (3.3) | 26.8 | (3.1) | 18.9 | (2.8) | 22.1 | (2.6) | 17.6 | (3.2) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 22.5 | (3.9) | 35.9 | (3.5) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 40.3 | (4.2) | 35.3 | (4.3) | 24.0 | (3.6) | 15.9 | (3.4) | 31.7 | (3.9) | 15.3 | (3.3) | 9.8 | (2.6) | 42.0 | (4.2) |
|  | Latvia | 20.5 | (2.9) | 26.9 | (2.7) | 4.1 | (1.4) | 2.6 | (1.3) | 37.6 | (3.2) | 13.8 | (2.4) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 28.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 64.3 | (0.6) | 69.2 | (1.4) | 70.3 | (1.2) | 6.9 | (1.1) | 17.4 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 4.4 | (0.7) | 76.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Lithuania | 60.9 | (3.2) | 19.1 | (2.2) | 4.1 | (1.4) | 23.0 | (2.9) | 35.4 | (3.4) | 38.0 | (3.4) | 11.6 | (2.9) | 19.8 | (2.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 5.8 | (0.1) | 64.2 | (0.1) | 43.6 | (0.1) | 9.3 | (0.1) | 11.4 | (0.1) | 47.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 72.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 30.1 | (6.6) | 36.4 | (8.2) | 22.1 | (7.2) | 17.4 | (5.8) | 17.5 | (5.9) | 6.7 | (3.6) | 3.1 | (3.1) | 47.9 | (9.7) |
|  | Montenegro | c | c | C | C | C | c | c | c | C | C | C | c | C | C | C | c |
|  | Peru | 6.5 | (1.8) | 18.0 | (3.1) | 9.6 | (2.2) | 10.2 | (2.2) | 12.8 | (2.7) | 15.2 | (2.5) | 12.3 | (2.4) | 23.1 | (3.0) |
|  | Qatar | 45.6 | (0.3) | 57.1 | (0.3) | 24.8 | (0.3) | 34.2 | (0.3) | 19.8 | (0.2) | 31.1 | (0.3) | 4.6 | (0.2) | 58.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Romania | 9.6 | (2.3) | 30.6 | (3.3) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 10.5 | (2.2) | 15.4 | (2.8) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 35.0 | (3.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 50.1 | (4.3) | 11.2 | (2.0) | 9.2 | (1.8) | 37.8 | (3.9) | 43.6 | (4.1) | 9.3 | (2.8) | 4.3 | (1.7) | 18.8 | (2.4) |
|  | Serbia | c | c | C | c | C | c | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
|  | Shanghai-China | 49.7 | (5.7) | 17.4 | (4.2) | 14.6 | (3.5) | 39.6 | (5.4) | 15.5 | (4.6) | 3.9 | (2.3) | 4.2 | (2.3) | 24.9 | (4.4) |
|  | Singapore | 8.8 | (2.0) | 81.0 | (2.6) | 11.7 | (2.3) | 3.0 | (1.0) | 3.7 | (1.5) | 4.6 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 81.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 47.7 | (6.6) | 21.7 | (4.7) | 13.3 | (5.1) | 24.3 | (6.0) | 11.5 | (4.0) | 11.5 | (4.0) | 4.4 | (2.8) | 27.7 | (5.8) |
|  | Thailand | 45.8 | (5.1) | 78.0 | (4.5) | 73.5 | (4.4) | 50.1 | (5.0) | 47.8 | (5.1) | 14.9 | (3.8) | 15.4 | (4.8) | 88.9 | (2.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 48.9 | (5.5) | 48.6 | (6.6) | 12.6 | (3.6) | 2.6 | (1.8) | 4.9 | (2.9) | 9.9 | (3.1) | 1.8 | (1.8) | 52.5 | (6.5) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 42.6 | (3.9) | 66.7 | (4.4) | 31.0 | (3.4) | 36.5 | (5.0) | 23.9 | (4.2) | 42.0 | (4.8) | 16.9 | (4.8) | 69.8 | (3.5) |
|  | Uruguay | 33.2 | (4.0) | 15.9 | (3.0) | 6.9 | (2.1) | 8.3 | (2.3) | 7.5 | (2.5) | 12.2 | (3.4) | 8.5 | (2.8) | 18.2 | (3.5) |
|  | Viet Nam | 48.1 | (10.7) | 57.5 | (11.2) | 11.5 | (6.8) | 38.6 | (11.9) | 19.7 | (8.9) | 12.0 | (8.1) | 14.1 | (9.0) | 57.5 | (11.2) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 2/3]
School admissions policies, by level of education
Table IV.2.8 Results based on school principals' reports


| © Albania | 43.1 | (5.3) | 48.5 | (5.1) | 33.2 | (4.3) | 30.6 | (4.8) | 40.7 | (5.5) | 29.0 | (4.8) | 25.5 | (5.3) | 57.8 | (5.3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Argentina | 20.0 | (2.6) | 12.9 | (3.2) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 28.6 | (4.2) | 19.8 | (3.7) | 49.8 | (4.3) | 11.5 | (3.8) | 18.6 | (3.3) |
| © Brazil | 37.4 | (2.5) | 16.7 | (1.9) | 6.7 | (1.5) | 18.8 | (2.1) | 13.6 | (1.8) | 11.4 | (2.0) | 24.9 | (3.0) | 20.3 | (2.1) |
| Bulgaria | 16.1 | (2.3) | 82.7 | (2.8) | 16.6 | (2.9) | 45.9 | (4.0) | 27.1 | (3.7) | 16.8 | (2.2) | 3.8 | (1.2) | 83.5 | (2.8) |
| Colombia | 25.9 | (3.7) | 39.2 | (4.2) | 16.3 | (3.3) | 25.9 | (3.8) | 12.8 | (3.1) | 29.8 | (4.4) | 15.7 | (3.3) | 43.2 | (4.3) |
| Costa Rica | 48.5 | (5.0) | 52.4 | (4.9) | 15.8 | (2.7) | 35.0 | (4.3) | 36.9 | (5.3) | 11.2 | (1.7) | 35.4 | (7.4) | 57.4 | (4.6) |
| Croatia | 6.6 | (1.3) | 95.6 | (1.8) | 7.2 | (1.8) | 17.8 | (3.2) | 25.0 | (3.6) | 1.2 | (0.9) | 3.8 | (1.5) | 96.0 | (1.7) |
| Cyprus* | 67.1 | (0.1) | 17.8 | (0.1) | 7.6 | (0.0) | 14.1 | (0.1) | 34.8 | (0.1) | 18.0 | (0.1) | 8.1 | (0.1) | 23.1 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 14.2 | (2.9) | 92.7 | (1.9) | 28.7 | (3.9) | 31.1 | (4.1) | 7.8 | (2.3) | 18.1 | (3.9) | 49.9 | (9.7) | 95.0 | (1.3) |
| Indonesia | 38.9 | (5.6) | 62.6 | (4.7) | 28.2 | (5.5) | 30.0 | (6.1) | 62.1 | (5.1) | 30.6 | (5.6) | 25.7 | (4.7) | 66.6 | (4.9) |
| Jordan | C | c | C | C | c | c | C | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c |
| Kazakhstan | 31.5 | (4.5) | 46.6 | (5.8) | 25.1 | (4.5) | 17.9 | (4.1) | 32.2 | (5.2) | 15.3 | (4.5) | 9.2 | (3.1) | 54.7 | (5.3) |
| Latvia | 20.7 | (5.9) | 43.5 | (10.6) | 2.8 | (1.6) | 0.6 | (0.5) | 27.0 | (7.4) | 13.5 | (5.0) | 1.1 | (1.1) | 44.7 | (10.6) |
| Liechtenstein | C | c | c | C | C | c | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | C |
| Lithuania | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c | C | C | c |
| Macao-China | 6.3 | (0.1) | 74.3 | (0.1) | 46.9 | (0.1) | 11.5 | (0.1) | 11.9 | (0.1) | 54.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 83.9 | (0.1) |
| Malaysia | 31.2 | (3.7) | 46.1 | (4.3) | 26.6 | (3.6) | 27.2 | (3.5) | 26.1 | (3.5) | 10.7 | (2.4) | 4.7 | (1.7) | 54.8 | (4.4) |
| Montenegro | 7.5 | (0.1) | 52.4 | (0.1) | 27.9 | (0.1) | 16.3 | (0.1) | 40.9 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.0) | 5.7 | (0.1) | 59.4 | (0.1) |
| Peru | 6.6 | (1.8) | 29.3 | (4.1) | 7.0 | (1.9) | 18.4 | (3.0) | 16.3 | (3.1) | 21.5 | (3.0) | 13.2 | (2.6) | 33.2 | (4.0) |
| Qatar | 49.0 | (0.1) | 44.8 | (0.1) | 23.9 | (0.1) | 34.0 | (0.1) | 24.0 | (0.1) | 44.3 | (0.1) | 15.3 | (0.1) | 48.7 | (0.1) |
| Romania | C | C | C | c | c | C | C | c | C | C | C | c | c | c | c | C |
| Russian Federation | 29.8 | (4.4) | 32.5 | (5.2) | 16.7 | (3.6) | 43.7 | (6.2) | 48.1 | (4.4) | 9.2 | (3.6) | 5.2 | (2.0) | 43.3 | (5.4) |
| Serbia | 3.2 | (1.5) | 85.8 | (2.6) | 13.1 | (3.2) | 15.5 | (3.3) | 61.5 | (4.2) | 4.8 | (2.0) | 0.0 | c | 87.2 | (2.6) |
| Shanghai-China | 13.7 | (4.0) | 69.5 | (4.2) | 16.4 | (3.6) | 45.2 | (5.8) | 17.9 | (3.6) | 3.8 | (2.1) | 7.8 | (3.0) | 74.4 | (3.9) |
| Singapore | 7.7 | (0.6) | 79.2 | (0.6) | 15.9 | (0.7) | 4.9 | (0.1) | 7.4 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (0.6) | 3.6 | (0.5) | 82.1 | (0.2) |
| Chinese Taipei | 15.8 | (3.2) | 59.2 | (3.7) | 13.8 | (2.7) | 31.9 | (4.5) | 46.5 | (4.8) | 20.8 | (3.7) | 4.4 | (2.2) | 62.5 | (3.8) |
| Thailand | 41.8 | (3.9) | 81.9 | (2.5) | 70.4 | (3.5) | 55.5 | (4.1) | 62.4 | (3.9) | 21.4 | (3.6) | 21.3 | (4.7) | 88.3 | (2.4) |
| Tunisia | 59.3 | (5.0) | 39.8 | (5.4) | 29.4 | (5.3) | 2.3 | (1.3) | 6.8 | (2.6) | 10.0 | (3.5) | 5.6 | (2.6) | 49.5 | (5.7) |
| United Arab Emirates | 40.6 | (2.4) | 66.1 | (2.2) | 33.9 | (2.5) | 39.4 | (2.8) | 24.9 | (2.2) | 43.9 | (2.8) | 9.9 | (1.3) | 70.1 | (2.3) |
| Uruguay | 22.3 | (2.7) | 32.9 | (4.0) | 8.1 | (1.8) | 24.2 | (3.4) | 8.3 | (2.6) | 19.9 | (3.2) | 14.6 | (3.7) | 34.0 | (4.2) |
| Viet Nam | 40.5 | (4.3) | 89.6 | (2.8) | 38.6 | (4.3) | 56.5 | (4.5) | 29.3 | (4.1) | 6.5 | (2.2) | 9.9 | (2.5) | 90.3 | (2.7) |

[^21]［Part 3／3］
School admissions policies，by level of education
Table IV．2．8 Results based on school principals＇reports


Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 唡列约 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957422
[Part 1/2]
School transfer policies
Table IV.2.9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in sc <br> ow academic achievement |  |  |  |  | whos | prin | pal | oorte | that schoo | a stud ol for | $\text { nt in } 1$ e foll |  | eas | od | $\text { rade } f$ | $\text { or } 15$ | ar- | s wou | d be | ransf | red |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | High academic achievement | Behavioural problems |  |  |  |  |  | Special learning needs |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Not likely | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  |
|  |  | \% S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% $\quad$ S.E. |  | $\% \quad \text { S.E. }$ |  | $\% \quad \text { S.E. }$ |  | $\% \quad \text { S.E. }$ |  | \% $\quad$ S.E. |  | \% S.E. |  | \% S.E. |  | \% S.E. |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  |  |  |  | 96.1 (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 92.6 | (1.2) | 5.5 | (1.0) | 1.9 | (0.6) | 74.8 | (1.7) | 23.0 | (1.6) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 90.3 | (1.2) | 8.8 | (1.1) | 0.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | 17.6 (2.9) | 22.1 | (3.7) | 60.3 | (3.9) | 95.0 | (1.8) | 4.6 | (1.8) | 0.4 | (0.6) | 45.6 | (4.8) | 47.2 | (4.6) | 7.2 | (2.0) | 57.9 | (4.1) | 36.1 | (3.9) | 6.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Belgium | 45.1 (2.9) | 38.2 | (3.2) | 16.7 | (2.3) | 92.5 | (1.5) | 5.9 | (1.3) | 1.6 | (0.7) | 36.6 | (2.9) | 50.1 | (3.2) | 13.3 | (2.2) | 53.7 | (3.3) | 41.1 | (3.2) | 5.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Canada | 95.5 (0.8) | 3.7 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 98.9 | (0.3) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 73.6 | (2.2) | 23.9 | (2.1) | 2.4 | (0.5) | 84.0 | (1.7) | 13.3 | (1.6) | 2.7 | 0.7) |
|  | Chile | 62.9 (3.5) | 30.5 | (3.3) | 6.6 | (1.9) | 67.9 | (3.7) | 23.5 | (3.4) | 8.6 | (2.2) | 24.7 | (3.0) | 59.2 | (3.6) | 16.1 | (2.6) | 58.9 | (3.7) | 32.2 | (3.7) | 8.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Czech Repu | 75.7 (3.1) | 18.0 | (2.7) | 6.4 | (1.5) | 92.8 | (1.7) | 6.3 | (1.7) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 76.9 | (3.0) | 18.8 | (2.9) | 4.3 | (1.4) | 92.7 | (2.5) | 3.4 | (1.4) | 3.9 | (1.8) |
|  | Denmark | 90.3 (2.3) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 87.5 | (2.2) | 12.5 | (2.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 55.2 | (3.5) | 42.6 | (3.4) | 2.1 | (1.1) | 72.6 | (3.3) | 25.5 | (3.3) | 1.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Estonia | 90.0 (1.6) | 8.6 | (1.4) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 84.4 | (2.5) | 12.2 | (2.2) | 3.4 | (1.2) | 74.3 | (2.7) | 25.0 | (2.6) | 0.8 | (0.5) | 56.7 | (3.1) | 40.0 | (3.0) | 3.3 | 1.2) |
|  | Finland | 98.6 (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 98.8 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 85.8 | (2.5) | 14.0 | (2.5) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 90.2 | (1.9) | 9.6 | (1.9) | 0.2 | (0.0) |
|  | France | 77.8 (2.5) | 18.0 | (2.6) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 90.1 | (2.2) | 9.5 | (2.1) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 48.5 | (3.2) | 43.4 | (3.3) | 8.1 | (1.9) | 44.6 | (3.2) | 47.2 | (3.3) | 8.2 | (2.0) |
|  | Germany | 68.9 (3.1) | 28.0 | (3.0) | 3.1 | (1.3) | 88.8 | (2.3) | 9.1 | (2.1) | 2.1 | (1.0) | 79.6 | (2.9) | 19.3 | (2.8) | 1.0 | (0.8) | 90.6 | 2.1) | 6.7 | 1.7) | 2.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Greece | 40.4 (3.6) | 48.1 | (3.6) | 11.5 | (2.2) | 82.8 | (3.2) | 11.0 | (2.6) | 6.2 | (2.0) | 19.9 | (3.4) | 68.2 | (3.9) | 11.8 | (2.3) | 45.9 | (3.7) | 45.2 | (3.6) | 8.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Hungary | 52.3 (3.4) | 41.1 | (3.7) | 6.6 | (2.2) | 91.9 | (1.9) | 5.8 | (1.6) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 42.5 | (3.2) | 47.3 | (3.5) | 10.2 | (2.1) | 91. | (2.1) | 5.9 | (1.7) | 3. | (1.4) |
|  | Iceland | 99.9 (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 94.1 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 79.2 | (0.2) | 20.8 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 91.0 | (0.1) | 8.3 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 94.1 (2.0) | 4.1 | (1.7) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 97.1 | (1.0) | 2.9 | (1.0) | 0.0 | C | 87.6 | (2.7) | 11.2 | (2.5) | 1.2 | (0.9) | 93.8 | (1.7) | 4.5 | (1.3) | 1.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Israel | 69.7 (4.1) | 25.7 | (3.9) | 4.6 | (1.9) | 90.9 | (1.9) | 9.1 | (1.9) | 0.0 | c | 28.4 | (3.7) | 56.0 | (4.1) | 15.6 | (3.0) | 39.3 | (4.3) | 52.1 | (4.3) | 8.6 | (2.2) |
|  | Italy | 37.7 (2.1) | 49.4 | (2.4) | 13.0 | (1.3) | 97.6 | (0.6) | 2.4 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 62.5 | (1.8) | 34.3 | (1.8) | 3.2 | (0.8) | 70.1 | (1.8) | 27.2 | (1.8) | 2.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Japan | 38.3 (3.4) | 56.9 | (3.7) | 4.8 | (1.5) | 99.2 | (0.6) | 0.8 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 40.4 | (3.2) | 58.1 | (3.4) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 82.2 | (2.7) | 16.7 | (2.6) | 1. | 0.8) |
|  | Korea | 70.3 (3.8) | 18.9 | (3.2) | 10.9 | (2.6) | 88.7 | (2.7) | 8.6 | (2.4) | 2.7 | (1.4) | 37.0 | (3.9) | 43.4 | (4.1) | 19.6 | (2.7) | 74.1 | (3.8) | 24.5 | (3.8) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 72.8 (0.1) | 20.5 | (0.1) | 6.7 | (0.0) | 87.9 | (0.1) | 9.2 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.0) | 46.4 | (0.1) | 40.2 | (0.1) | 13.4 | (0.1) | 59.4 | (0.1) | 39.7 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 58.6 (1.9) | 36.0 | (1.9) | 5.4 | (0.8) | 75.2 | (1.7) | 18.5 | (1.5) | 6.3 | (1.2) | 37.7 | (1.7) | 50.5 | (2.0) | 11.8 | (1.3) | 50.6 | (1.9) | 39.9 | (1.8) | 9.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 77.5 (3.8) | 17.5 | (3.4) | 5.0 | (1.8) | 90.0 | (2.4) | 10.0 | (2.4) | 0.0 | c | 62.8 | (3.8) | 35.0 | (3.7) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 56.5 | (4.5) | 39.9 | (4.6) | 3.6 | (1.4) |
|  | New Zealand | 97.1 (1.3) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 1.1 | (0.8) | 83.2 | (3.4) | 14.4 | (3.1) | 2.4 | (1.4) | 95.8 | (2.0) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 2.9 | (1.8) |
|  | Norway | 100.0 (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 97.6 | (1.1) | 1.8 | (1.0) | 0.6 | (0.5) | 77.4 | (2.9) | 21.9 | (2.9) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 95.6 | (1.6) | 4.4 | (1.6) | 0.0 | C |
|  | Poland | 90.2 (2.4) | 9.1 | (2.3) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 93.7 | (1.8) | 6.3 | (1.8) | 0.0 | C | 58.1 | (4.2) | 39.5 | (4.1) | 2.5 | (1.2) | 50.8 | (4.1) | 47.5 | (4.0) | 1.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Portugal | 85.6 (2.9) | 13.0 | (2.8) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 93.0 | (2.3) | 7.0 | (2.3) | 0.0 | c | 64.9 | (3.5) | 33.0 | (3.6) | 2.1 | (1.4) | 89.7 | (2.2) | 10.0 | (2.2) | 0.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 57.1 (3.4) | 28.2 | (2.9) | 14.6 | (2.5) | 84.3 | (2.9) | 13.2 | (2.4) | 2.5 | (1.7) | 41.8 | (3.4) | 44.7 | (3.9) | 13.5 | (2.9) | 59.9 | (3.9) | 37.7 | (3.8) | 2.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Slovenia | 21.0 (0.8) | 61.1 | (0.6) | 17.9 | (0.3) | 81.9 | (0.3) | 15.8 | (0.3) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 22.5 | (0.9) | 70.4 | (0.9) | 7.1 | (0.2) | 65.2 | (0.7) | 34.4 | (0.7) | 0.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Spain | 97.8 (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.1 | (0.5) | 1.5 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 76.0 | (2.2) | 23.2 | (2.2) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 82.3 | (1.8) | 15.3 | (1.7) | 2.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Sweden | 98.0 (0.9) | 1.9 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 94.4 | (1.8) | 4.3 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 88.7 | (2.5) | 11.2 | (2.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 69.0 | (3.0) | 27.6 | (2.8) | 3.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 78.8 (3.0) | 15.1 | (2.8) | 6.1 | (1.8) | 73.1 | (3.0) | 14.1 | (2.1) | 12.7 | (2.3) | 59.2 | (3.3) | 37.7 | (3.2) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 63.2 | (3.1) | 33.4 | (3.0) | 3.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 58.5 (4.2) | 32.1 | (4.1) | 9.3 | (2.3) | 74.6 | (3.4) | 20.6 | (2.8) | 4.7 | (2.1) | 37.2 | (4.5) | 45.0 | (4.1) | 17.8 | (3.2) | 60.8 | (4.1) | 30.3 | (3.8) | 8.9 | (2.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 95.9 (1.6) | 2.4 | (1.3) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 96.7 | (1.1) | 3.2 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 71.7 | (3.9) | 25.6 | (3.5) | 2.7 | (1.2) | 95.7 | (1.6) | 4.1 | (1.6) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | United States | 91.5 (2.1) | 8.0 | (2.0) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 96.4 | (1.7) | 3.2 | (1.7) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 65.1 | (3.8) | 31.2 | (4.2) | 3.7 | (1.5) | 88.6 | (2.4) | 10.4 | (2.3) | 0.9 | (0.7) |
|  | OECD average | 73.6 (0.4) | 19.8 | (0.4) | 6.6 | (0.3) | 90.2 | (0.3) | 7.8 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 57.8 | (0.5) | 36.2 | (0.5) | 6.0 | (0.3) | 72.4 | (0.5) | 24.2 | (0.5) | 3.3 | (0.2) |



* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 2/2]
School transfer policies
Table IV.2.9 Results based on school principals' reports

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
［Part 1／3］
School transfer policies，by level of education
Table IV．2．10 Results based on school principals＇reports


Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 亦正地 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957422
［Part 2／3］
School transfer policies，by level of education
Table IV．2．10 Results based on school principals＇reports


Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 泀定四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957422
[Part 3/3]
School transfer policies, by level of education
Table IV.2.10 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
es at the beginning of this Annex.
StatLink 泀ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957422
［Part 1／2］
Ability grouping for mathematics classes
Table IV．2．11 Results based on school principals＇reports


| ： | Albania | 33.5 | （4．2） | 66.0 | （4．2） | 0.5 | （0．4） | 19.1 | （2．8） | 66.9 | （3．6） | 14.0 | （2．9） | 30.9 | （4．0） | 38.4 | （4．2） | 30.7 | （3．8） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 34.6 | （3．4） | 49.5 | （4．0） | 15.9 | （3．2） | 18.1 | （2．9） | 38.7 | （4．4） | 43.1 | （3．7） | 5.1 | （2．1） | 19.4 | （2．9） | 75.4 | （3．5） |
|  | Brazil | 48.3 | （2．6） | 30.0 | （2．3） | 21.7 | （2．4） | 22.0 | （2．5） | 24.8 | （2．4） | 53.2 | （3．0） | 4.9 | （1．2） | 13.4 | （2．0） | 81.7 | （2．1） |
|  | Bulgaria | 15.2 | （2．9） | 71.4 | （3．7） | 13.4 | （2．6） | 20.7 | （3．2） | 57.6 | （4．3） | 21.7 | （3．9） | 4.4 | （1．6） | 69.0 | （3．7） | 26.6 | （3．4） |
|  | Colombia | 32.7 | （3．7） | 58.9 | （4．0） | 8.4 | （2．1） | 18.4 | （3．0） | 66.7 | （3．8） | 14.9 | （2．4） | 9.4 | （2．3） | 48.2 | （3．7） | 42.4 | （3．8） |
|  | Costa Rica | 20.7 | （3．4） | 32.8 | （3．6） | 46.5 | （4．1） | 15.2 | （2．9） | 24.3 | （3．3） | 60.5 | （3．7） | 12.0 | （2．3） | 43.4 | （4．1） | 44.6 | （4．0） |
|  | Croatia | 42.5 | （4．2） | 45.5 | （4．0） | 12.0 | （2．8） | 21.2 | （2．8） | 55.1 | （3．8） | 23.8 | （3．3） | 1.4 | （1．0） | 44.3 | （4．1） | 54.3 | （4．1） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 34.0 | （0．1） | 14.4 | （0．1） | 51.7 | （0．1） | 6.4 | （0．0） | 9.2 | （0．1） | 84.3 | （0．1） | 8.3 | （0．0） | 15.7 | （0．1） | 75.9 | （0．1） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 28.5 | （3．9） | 61.2 | （4．4） | 10.3 | （2．4） | 16.3 | （3．0） | 58.0 | （4．0） | 25.7 | （3．9） | 5.4 | （1．7） | 37.5 | （4．1） | 57.1 | （4．3） |
|  | Indonesia | 45.0 | （3．6） | 24.8 | （3．6） | 30.2 | （3．6） | 23.5 | （3．6） | 36.3 | （3．8） | 40.2 | （3．5） | 13.1 | （2．5） | 14.7 | （2．7） | 72.2 | （3．3） |
|  | Jordan | 49.9 | （3．8） | 30.5 | （3．1） | 19.5 | （3．2） | 15.3 | （2．4） | 41.0 | （3．6） | 43.7 | （3．8） | 11.7 | （2．5） | 13.5 | （3．0） | 74.8 | （3．6） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 51.3 | （3．8） | 43.9 | （3．8） | 4.8 | （1．6） | 22.8 | （3．8） | 50.0 | （4．1） | 27.2 | （3．5） | 34.3 | （4．0） | 42.4 | （4．1） | 23.3 | （3．3） |
|  | Latvia | 31.8 | （3．3） | 49.6 | （3．8） | 18.7 | （3．1） | 9.7 | （2．3） | 41.9 | （4．1） | 48.4 | （3．6） | 6.2 | （2．0） | 59.4 | （3．4） | 34.3 | （3．3） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 39.0 | （1．2） | 20.8 | （1．3） | 40.1 | （0．7） | 10.6 | （0．6） | 19.4 | （1．3） | 70.1 | （1．2） | 50.5 | （0．8） | 14.5 | （0．9） | 35.1 | （0．9） |
|  | Lithuania | 58.3 | （3．4） | 24.2 | （3．1） | 17.5 | （2．8） | 8.9 | （2．0） | 23.2 | （3．1） | 67.9 | （3．6） | 36.9 | （3．7） | 28.1 | （3．6） | 35.0 | （3．3） |
|  | Macao－China | 10.8 | （0．0） | 55.3 | （0．0） | 33.9 | （0．0） | 11.6 | （0．0） | 50.1 | （0．1） | 38.3 | （0．1） | 1.1 | （0．0） | 36.7 | （0．1） | 62.2 | （0．1） |
|  | Malaysia | 38.6 | （3．9） | 56.9 | （3．8） | 4.5 | （1．6） | 13.0 | （2．2） | 53.8 | （3．6） | 33.2 | （3．5） | 14.8 | （2．6） | 32.2 | （3．3） | 53.0 | （3．7） |
|  | Montenegro | 19.4 | （0．1） | 70.5 | （0．1） | 10.1 | （0．1） | 14.2 | （0．1） | 75.1 | （0．2） | 10.7 | （0．2） | 0.6 | （0．0） | 7.7 | （0．1） | 91.7 | （0．1） |
|  | Peru | 31.2 | （3．0） | 53.8 | （3．4） | 14.9 | （2．4） | 26.5 | （3．4） | 34.3 | （3．3） | 39.2 | （3．5） | 8.1 | （1．9） | 47.0 | （3．3） | 44.8 | （3．3） |
|  | Qatar | 56.9 | （0．1） | 31.3 | （0．1） | 11.8 | （0．0） | 29.4 | （0．1） | 37.8 | （0．1） | 32.8 | （0．1） | 13.4 | （0．1） | 28.3 | （0．1） | 58.3 | （0．1） |
|  | Romania | 35.9 | （3．6） | 45.6 | （3．9） | 18.5 | （3．0） | 26.3 | （3．1） | 57.4 | （3．5） | 16.2 | （2．6） | 25.1 | （3．5） | 40.2 | （3．9） | 34.7 | （3．8） |
|  | Russian Federation | 48.4 | （3．6） | 46.4 | （3．6） | 5.2 | （1．5） | 14.5 | （2．0） | 21.3 | （2．5） | 64.2 | （3．0） | 5.2 | （1．9） | 79.2 | （3．0） | 15.5 | （2．3） |
|  | Serbia | 38.5 | （3．5） | 51.3 | （3．8） | 10.1 | （2．8） | 22.4 | （3．3） | 54.5 | （4．1） | 23.1 | （3．7） | 6.3 | （2．4） | 33.7 | （4．4） | 60.0 | （4．2） |
|  | Shanghai－China | 36.3 | （4．2） | 55.8 | （4．1） | 7.9 | （2．2） | 13.0 | （2．6） | 51.1 | （3．6） | 35.9 | （3．7） | 16.2 | （3．2） | 52.6 | （4．4） | 31.2 | （3．9） |
|  | Singapore | 27.8 | （0．2） | 66.3 | （0．6） | 5.8 | （0．6） | 6.7 | （0．6） | 54.9 | （0．6） | 38.4 | （0．3） | 11.8 | （0．5） | 73.5 | （0．5） | 14.7 | （0．1） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 22.6 | （3．5） | 57.2 | （3．9） | 20.1 | （2．7） | 10.0 | （2．4） | 52.5 | （4．0） | 37.5 | （3．9） | 4.5 | （1．6） | 26.6 | （3．9） | 69.0 | （4．1） |
|  | Thailand | 5.4 | （1．9） | 68.3 | （3．3） | 26.4 | （3．3） | 0.0 | c | 57.1 | （3．4） | 42.9 | （3．4） | 0.7 | （0．7） | 50.3 | （3．8） | 49.0 | （3．8） |
|  | Tunisia | 40.6 | （4．2） | 36.0 | （4．1） | 23.5 | （3．3） | 28.9 | （4．0） | 32.6 | （4．3） | 38.6 | （4．3） | 4.8 | （1．8） | 11.0 | （2．4） | 84.2 | （3．0） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 57.1 | （2．7） | 25.1 | （2．1） | 17.8 | （2．2） | 31.6 | （2．6） | 22.8 | （2．1） | 45.7 | （2．6） | 42.2 | （1．9） | 37.6 | （2．3） | 20.2 | （1．8） |
|  | Uruguay | 25.0 | （3．2） | 64.1 | （3．5） | 10.9 | （2．4） | 16.1 | （2．8） | 58.6 | （3．7） | 25.3 | （3．4） | 1.4 | （1．0） | 8.1 | （2．1） | 90.5 | （2．1） |
|  | Viet Nam | 38.4 | （4．1） | 53.0 | （4．6） | 8.6 | （2．2） | 7.0 | （1．9） | 55.4 | （4．2） | 37.6 | （4．3） | 10.8 | （2．6） | 35.0 | （4．3） | 54.3 | （4．1） |

＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink 唡两両 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957422
[Part 2/2]
Ability grouping for mathematics classes
Table IV.2.11 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In mathematics classes, teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { For } \\ \text { all classes } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { For } \\ \text { some classes } \end{gathered}$ |  | Not for any classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| 8 | Australia | 21.3 | (1.3) | 50.2 | (1.5) | 28.5 | (1.7) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 48.6 | (1.7) | 49.8 | (1.6) |
| H | Austria | 31.4 | (3.9) | 51.8 | (4.4) | 16.9 | (2.9) | 71.9 | (2.3) | 14.7 | (2.3) | 13.4 | (1.8) |
|  | Belgium | 55.8 | (3.3) | 27.7 | (2.8) | 16.4 | (2.2) | 20.6 | (2.9) | 57.0 | (3.1) | 22.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Canada | 35.4 | (2.8) | 47.7 | (2.7) | 16.9 | (2.0) | 7.1 | (1.2) | 49.2 | (2.5) | 43.8 | (2.7) |
|  | Chile | 48.9 | (3.8) | 24.2 | (3.7) | 26.8 | (3.5) | 35.7 | (3.8) | 24.5 | (3.6) | 39.8 | (4.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 49.8 | (3.7) | 37.4 | (3.6) | 12.8 | (2.0) | 58.8 | (4.2) | 30.6 | (3.7) | 10.6 | (2.7) |
|  | Denmark | 42.4 | (3.6) | 52.1 | (3.7) | 5.5 | (1.7) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 58.0 | (3.8) | 17.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Estonia | 47.6 | (2.9) | 44.8 | (2.8) | 7.6 | (1.1) | 10.9 | (2.1) | 61.1 | (2.9) | 28.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Finland | 51.7 | (2.9) | 37.2 | (3.2) | 11.1 | (2.3) | 35.5 | (3.5) | 46.4 | (3.8) | 18.0 | (2.5) |
|  | France | 67.6 | (3.1) | 22.6 | (2.8) | 9.7 | (2.0) | 43.8 | (3.5) | 31.4 | (3.2) | 24.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Germany | 40.9 | (3.5) | 33.4 | (3.2) | 25.7 | (3.1) | 31.9 | (3.1) | 32.9 | (3.4) | 35.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Greece | 63.7 | (4.1) | 18.8 | (3.4) | 17.5 | (3.0) | 81.4 | (3.2) | 11.3 | (3.2) | 7.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Hungary | 55.9 | (4.0) | 33.8 | (3.7) | 10.3 | (2.4) | 23.3 | (2.9) | 31.2 | (3.8) | 45.5 | (3.8) |
|  | Iceland | 67.9 | (0.2) | 29.1 | (0.2) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 12.9 | (0.1) | 40.8 | (0.2) | 46.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 18.7 | (3.0) | 41.6 | (3.8) | 39.7 | (4.1) | 0.8 | (0.7) | 40.2 | (4.0) | 59.0 | (4.0) |
|  | Israel | 17.0 | (3.0) | 32.8 | (3.9) | 50.2 | (4.1) | 1.7 | (1.0) | 41.4 | (3.8) | 56.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Italy | 44.9 | (2.2) | 41.2 | (2.1) | 13.9 | (1.6) | 24.1 | (1.7) | 48.7 | (1.9) | 27.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Japan | 42.1 | (3.7) | 40.9 | (3.7) | 17.0 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (3.7) | 44.6 | (3.6) | 18.6 | (2.9) |
|  | Korea | 17.2 | (3.1) | 51.0 | (4.0) | 31.8 | (3.6) | 9.9 | (2.3) | 48.6 | (3.8) | 41.5 | (3.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 44.4 | (0.1) | 39.3 | (0.1) | 16.3 | (0.1) | 32.1 | (0.1) | 41.4 | (0.1) | 26.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 30.6 | (1.9) | 37.4 | (1.9) | 32.0 | (1.8) | 26.3 | (1.6) | 32.2 | (1.9) | 41.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 38.9 | (4.2) | 34.9 | (3.7) | 26.2 | (4.2) | 6.4 | (1.7) | 39.0 | (4.6) | 54.6 | (4.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 22.8 | (3.4) | 58.4 | (3.6) | 18.8 | (3.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 60.5 | (3.7) | 38.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Norway | 81.0 | (2.8) | 12.6 | (2.3) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 54.2 | (4.0) | 23.2 | (3.3) | 22.6 | (3.1) |
|  | Poland | 63.2 | (4.4) | 13.1 | (2.9) | 23.7 | (3.7) | 42.4 | (4.1) | 19.3 | (3.5) | 38.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Portugal | 60.9 | (4.0) | 32.3 | (3.8) | 6.7 | (2.7) | 38.3 | (4.1) | 38.1 | (3.7) | 23.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 55.9 | (4.1) | 25.7 | (3.2) | 18.3 | (3.4) | 28.4 | (3.3) | 39.1 | (3.3) | 32.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Slovenia | 27.3 | (0.7) | 64.3 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.4) | 50.5 | (0.7) | 42.1 | (0.7) | 7.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | 59.2 | (2.6) | 26.0 | (2.2) | 14.8 | (2.0) | 7.6 | (1.6) | 43.8 | (2.8) | 48.6 | (2.9) |
|  | Sweden | 55.9 | (4.0) | 33.8 | (3.3) | 10.3 | (2.3) | 15.7 | (2.8) | 27.8 | (3.3) | 56.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 36.7 | (3.2) | 30.6 | (3.2) | 32.7 | (2.8) | 15.0 | (2.3) | 40.9 | (3.4) | 44.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Turkey | 43.0 | (3.6) | 21.7 | (3.4) | 35.3 | (4.0) | 24.2 | (3.1) | 42.1 | (3.9) | 33.7 | (3.7) |
|  | United Kingdom | 5.4 | (1.4) | 14.0 | (2.0) | 80.6 | (2.2) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 37.1 | (3.4) | 62.2 | (3.5) |
|  | United States | 33.6 | (4.2) | 56.0 | (4.4) | 10.4 | (2.9) | 6.1 | (2.6) | 62.9 | (4.2) | 31.0 | (3.8) |
|  | OECD average | 43.5 | (0.6) | 35.8 | (0.5) | 20.7 | (0.5) | 25.9 | (0.5) | 39.7 | (0.6) | 34.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Albania | 50.1 | (3.9) | 39.2 | (3.7) | 10.7 | (2.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 51.8 | (4.4) | 48.2 | (4.4) |
| $\stackrel{1}{*}$ | Argentina | 43.3 | (3.5) | 37.4 | (4.1) | 19.2 | (3.3) | 14.5 | (3.0) | 47.5 | (4.1) | 38.0 | (3.6) |
| む | Brazil | 37.5 | (2.6) | 20.4 | (2.4) | 42.1 | (2.5) | 18.4 | (2.2) | 28.1 | (2.2) | 53.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Bulgaria | 41.2 | (3.8) | 55.9 | (3.8) | 2.9 | (1.3) | 6.9 | (2.1) | 62.6 | (4.1) | 30.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Colombia | 38.9 | (3.9) | 42.2 | (3.8) | 18.9 | (3.4) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 52.6 | (3.9) | 41.0 | (3.8) |
|  | Costa Rica | 40.6 | (3.8) | 31.4 | (3.8) | 27.9 | (4.1) | 39.6 | (4.2) | 34.8 | (3.8) | 25.6 | (3.8) |
|  | Croatia | 39.3 | (3.6) | 47.2 | (3.8) | 13.4 | (2.8) | 8.0 | (2.4) | 37.8 | (3.9) | 54.2 | (4.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 61.1 | (0.1) | 32.1 | (0.1) | 6.8 | (0.0) | 49.1 | (0.1) | 15.9 | (0.1) | 35.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 41.0 | (4.4) | 50.0 | (4.4) | 9.0 | (2.4) | 9.0 | (2.2) | 60.1 | (4.3) | 31.0 | (4.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 52.6 | (3.8) | 22.2 | (3.2) | 25.2 | (3.4) | 24.6 | (3.2) | 27.7 | (3.6) | 47.6 | (3.8) |
|  | Jordan | 61.6 | (3.0) | 22.4 | (3.0) | 16.0 | (2.7) | 18.3 | (3.2) | 28.7 | (2.9) | 53.0 | (3.7) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 30.4 | (3.9) | 44.6 | (4.4) | 25.0 | (3.4) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 37.9 | (4.0) | 59.6 | (4.1) |
|  | Latvia | 41.7 | (3.7) | 53.0 | (3.8) | 5.2 | (1.8) | 17.8 | (3.0) | 46.1 | (3.9) | 36.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 43.3 | (0.6) | 32.1 | (0.9) | 24.5 | (0.6) | 40.1 | (0.7) | 13.2 | (1.2) | 46.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Lithuania | 48.7 | (3.4) | 25.3 | (3.4) | 26.0 | (2.8) | 15.9 | (2.8) | 24.7 | (3.0) | 59.4 | (3.4) |
|  | Macao-China | 49.2 | (0.1) | 29.4 | (0.0) | 21.4 | (0.0) | 33.9 | (0.0) | 52.9 | (0.0) | 13.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 41.6 | (3.9) | 49.2 | (3.9) | 9.2 | (2.5) | 4.1 | (1.6) | 56.0 | (3.7) | 39.9 | (3.8) |
|  | Montenegro | 38.9 | (0.1) | 54.6 | (0.2) | 6.5 | (0.1) | 6.9 | (0.1) | 66.4 | (0.1) | 26.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 34.9 | (3.6) | 36.4 | (3.4) | 28.7 | (3.5) | 13.2 | (2.4) | 45.3 | (3.8) | 41.5 | (3.5) |
|  | Qatar | 50.8 | (0.1) | 31.6 | (0.1) | 17.5 | (0.1) | 8.4 | (0.0) | 30.0 | (0.1) | 61.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 33.1 | (3.7) | 52.3 | (3.8) | 14.6 | (2.5) | 9.7 | (2.2) | 44.3 | (3.6) | 45.9 | (3.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | 35.4 | (3.9) | 60.5 | (3.9) | 4.1 | (1.3) | 4.0 | (1.2) | 39.2 | (3.1) | 56.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Serbia | 41.1 | (4.8) | 36.8 | (4.3) | 22.1 | (3.6) | 5.2 | (2.1) | 47.9 | (4.1) | 46.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 49.2 | (3.8) | 43.1 | (3.8) | 7.7 | (2.0) | 5.9 | (1.9) | 54.8 | (4.1) | 39.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Singapore | 32.5 | (0.5) | 63.5 | (0.7) | 4.0 | (0.5) | 2.8 | (0.0) | 66.6 | (0.6) | 30.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 27.7 | (3.6) | 56.1 | (4.2) | 16.2 | (3.0) | 19.5 | (2.6) | 57.2 | (3.9) | 23.3 | (3.5) |
|  | Thailand | 21.1 | (2.5) | 74.4 | (3.0) | 4.4 | (1.7) | 23.7 | (2.8) | 71.0 | (3.1) | 5.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 51.7 | (4.0) | 18.5 | (3.0) | 29.8 | (4.0) | 17.7 | (2.9) | 32.1 | (3.8) | 50.2 | (4.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 62.1 | (2.4) | 28.4 | (2.5) | 9.5 | (1.3) | 13.8 | (2.2) | 21.9 | (1.8) | 64.2 | (2.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 40.0 | (3.9) | 38.5 | (3.5) | 21.5 | (3.3) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 58.6 | (3.8) | 32.5 | (3.5) |
|  | Viet Nam | 46.5 | (4.3) | 41.5 | (4.4) | 12.0 | (2.7) | 6.9 | (2.0) | 51.6 | (4.2) | 41.5 | (4.0) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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[Part 1/2]
Correlation between stratification and students' motivation
Table IV.2.14 System-level correlation

|  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of vertical stratification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Index <br> of vertical stratification$=$ |  | Variability in students' grade levels |  | Variability in students' primary school starting age |  | Grade repetition |  |
|  |  |  |  | (a) |  | (b) |  | (c) |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value |
| Index of instrumental motivation for mathematics | Mean index | 0.06 | (0.76) | -0.06 | (0.72) | 0.39 | (0.02) | -0.20 | (0.26) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.11 | (0.52) | -0.07 | (0.70) | 0.05 | (0.79) | 0.29 | $(0.10)^{1}$ |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | 0.02 | (0.93) | 0.02 | (0.90) | 0.28 | (0.11) | -0.27 | (0.13) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | 0.12 | (0.49) | -0.08 | (0.65) | 0.43 | (0.01) | -0.06 | (0.74) |
| Adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics ${ }^{2}$ | Mean index | 0.05 | (0.80) | -0.12 | (0.49) | 0.40 | (0.02) | -0.17 | (0.34) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | -0.04 | (0.82) | -0.10 | (0.58) | -0.06 | (0.75) | 0.06 | (0.73) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | 0.02 | (0.90) | -0.12 | (0.48) | 0.38 | (0.03) | -0.20 | (0.26) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | -0.02 | (0.93) | -0.11 | (0.53) | 0.07 | (0.70) | 0.01 | (0.97) |


|  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of vertical stratification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Index of vertical stratification |  | Variability in students' grade levels |  | $+\quad$ Variability in students ${ }^{\prime}$ primary school starting age |  | Grade repetition |  |
|  |  | (a) | (b) |  | (c) |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value |
| Index of instrumental motivation for mathematics | Mean index |  |  | 0.27 | (0.03) | 0.19 | (0.14) | 0.38 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.71) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | -0.05 | (0.72) | -0.13 | (0.31) | -0.08 | (0.51) | 0.11 | (0.38) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | 0.21 | (0.09) | 0.18 | (0.14) | 0.33 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.76) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | 0.24 | (0.05) | 0.13 | (0.30) | 0.33 | (0.01) | 0.09 | (0.49) |
| Adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics ${ }^{2}$ | Mean index | 0.24 | (0.05) | 0.14 | (0.27) | 0.34 | (0.01) | 0.07 | (0.57) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.04 | (0.76) | -0.03 | (0.80) | 0.03 | (0.84) | 0.10 | (0.43) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | 0.23 | (0.06) | 0.16 | (0.22) | 0.32 | (0.01) | 0.05 | (0.71) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | 0.20 | (0.11) | 0.14 | (0.27) | 0.16 | (0.21) | 0.19 | (0.14) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are in bold. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, the cell is shaded in grey.
(a) Standard deviation of students' grade levels (Table IV.2.4).
(b) Standard deviation of students' primary school starting age (Table IV.2.1).
(c) Percentage of students who have repeated a grade at least once in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school (Table IV.2.2).
(d) Number of school types or distinct education programmes available to 15-year-old students (Table IV.2.5).
(e) Percentage of students who are enrolled in a programme whose curriculum is pre-vocational or vocational (Table IV.2.6).
(f) First age of selection in the education system (Table IV.2.5) is subtracted from 15 . The negative values are set to 0 .
(g) Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported both "students' records of academic performance" and "recommendations of feeder schools" are always considered for admission (Table IV.2.7).
(h) Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds would be "very likely" be transferred to another school because of "low academic achievement", "behavioural problems" or "special learning needs" (Table IV.2.9).
(i) Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported one form of ability grouping for all mathematics classes (Table IV.2.11)

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a 1 appears in the cell.
2. See Annex A6 for more details on the adjustment.

[Part 2/2]
Correlation between stratification and students' motivation
Table IV.2.14 System-level correlation

|  |  | OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of horizontal stratification (between schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of horizontal stratification (within schools) |  |
|  |  | Index <br> of horizontal <br> stratification <br> (between schools) |  | $=\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of educational } \\ \text { tracks } \end{gathered}$ |  | Prevalence of vocational and pre-vocational ${ }^{+}$ programmes |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Early } \\ \text { selection } \end{gathered}$ |  | $+\underset{\text { Academic }}{\text { selectivity }} \boldsymbol{+}$ |  | School transfer rates |  | Ability grouping for all mathematics classes |  |
|  |  |  |  | (d) |  | (e) |  | (f) |  | (g) |  | (h) |  | (i) |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value |
| Index of instrumental motivation for mathematics | Mean index | -0.65 | (0.00) | -0.59 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.00) | -0.56 | (0.00) | -0.45 | (0.01) | -0.43 | (0.01) | 0.40 | (0.02) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.13 | (0.45) | -0.02 | (0.93) | 0.09 | (0.62) | 0.05 | (0.80) | 0.13 | (0.46) | 0.28 | (0.11) | -0.09 | (0.60) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | -0.56 | (0.00) | -0.45 | (0.01) | -0.43 | (0.01) | -0.41 | (0.02) | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.02) | 0.29 | (0.10) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | -0.62 | (0.00) | -0.61 | (0.00) | -0.45 | (0.01) | -0.54 | (0.00) | -0.49 | (0.00) | -0.33 | (0.05) | 0.24 | (0.17) |
| Adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics ${ }^{2}$ | Mean index | -0.66 | (0.00) | -0.57 | (0.00) | -0.60 | (0.00) | -0.57 | (0.00) | -0.32 | (0.06) | -0.53 | (0.00) | 0.47 | (0.01) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.23 | (0.18) | 0.12 | (0.49) | 0.20 | (0.27) | 0.29 | (0.09) | -0.03 | (0.88) | 0.34 | (0.05) | -0.18 | (0.31) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | -0.57 | (0.00) | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.55 | (0.00) | -0.22 | (0.21) | -0.47 | (0.00) | 0.43 | (0.01) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | -0.50 | (0.00) | -0.16 | (0.38) | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.39 | (0.02) | -0.19 | (0.28) | -0.71 | (0.00) | 0.24 | (0.17) |


|  |  | All participating countries and economies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of horizontal stratification (between schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of horizontal stratification (within schools) |  |
|  |  | Indexof horizontalstratification(between schools) |  | Number of educational tracks |  | Prevalence of vocational and pre-vocational programmes |  | Early selection |  | Academic selectivity |  | School transfer rates |  | Ability grouping for all mathematics classes |  |
|  |  | (d) | (e) |  | (f) |  | (g) |  | (h) |  | (i) |  |
|  |  | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value | Corr. | p-value |
| Index of instrumental motivation for mathematics | Mean index |  |  | -0.44 | (0.00) | -0.25 | (0.05) | -0.45 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.00) | -0.23 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | -0.17 | (0.17) | 0.37 | (0.00) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.03 | (0.78) | 0.03 | (0.81) | 0.07 | (0.56) | 0.13 | (0.30) | -0.17 | (0.18) | 0.07 | (0.59) | 0.02 | (0.88) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | -0.34 | (0.01) | -0.22 | (0.09) | -0.35 | (0.00) | -0.36 | (0.00) | -0.14 | (0.28) | -0.14 | (0.27) | 0.22 | (0.07) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | -0.48 | (0.00) | -0.28 | (0.03) | -0.44 | (0.00) | -0.38 | (0.00) | -0.34 | (0.01) | -0.19 | (0.13) | 0.28 | (0.03) |
| Adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics ${ }^{2}$ | Mean index | -0.49 | (0.00) | -0.24 | (0.06) | -0.48 | (0.00) | -0.35 | (0.00) | -0.19 | (0.13) | -0.40 | (0.00) | 0.27 | (0.03) |
|  | Variation in the index (standard deviation) | 0.15 | (0.24) | 0.09 | (0.47) | 0.19 | (0.12) | 0.15 | (0.23) | -0.21 | $(0.09)^{1}$ | 0.20 | (0.12) | 0.08 | (0.51) |
|  | 10th percentile of the index | -0.47 | (0.00) | -0.30 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.37 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.73) | -0.32 | (0.01) | 0.20 | (0.11) |
|  | 90th percentile of the index | -0.10 | (0.42) | 0.11 | (0.41) | -0.11 | (0.40) | -0.12 | (0.33) | -0.05 | (0.70) | -0.22 | $(0.07)^{1}$ | 0.01 | (0.92) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) are in bold. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, the cell is shaded in grey.
(a) Standard deviation of students' grade levels (Table IV.2.4)
(b) Standard deviation of students' primary school starting age (Table IV.2.1).
(c) Percentage of students who have repeated a grade at least once in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school (Table IV.2.2).
(d) Number of school types or distinct education programmes available to 15-year-old students (Table IV.2.5).
(e) Percentage of students who are enrolled in a programme whose curriculum is pre-vocational or vocational (Table IV.2.6).
(f) First age of selection in the education system (Table IV.2.5) is subtracted from 15. The negative values are set to 0.
(g) Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported both "students' records of academic performance" and "recommendations of feeder schools" are always considered or admission (Table IV.2.7).
(h) Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds would be "very likely" be transferred to another school because of "low academic achievement", "behavioural problems" or "special learning needs" (Table IV.2.9).
(i) Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported one form of ability grouping for all mathematics classes (Table IV.2.11)

1. While Pearson's correlation coefficients are presented in this table, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients are also computed in order to examine the robustness of the results. When Pearson's correlation coefficient is significant at least at the $10 \%$ level but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is not significant at the $10 \%$ level, a 1 appears in the cell.
2. See Annex A6 for more details on the adjustment.

[Part 1/1]
Stratification, variation in socio-economic status and performance, and students' motivation
Table IV.2.16 Results based on school principals' and students' reports and system-level data collection

|  |  | Differentiation |  |  | Socio-economic profiles (ESCS) ${ }^{1}$ |  | Academic profiles |  |  | Students' instrumental motivation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Vertical stratification | Horizontal stratification (between schools) | Horizontal stratification (within schools) | Variation in student socioeconomic status | Socioeconomic inclusion index (1-rho) | Mean mathematics performance | Variation in mathematics performance | Academic inclusion index (1-rho) | Index of instrumental motivation for mathematics |  | Adjusted index of instrumental motivation for mathematics |  |
|  |  | Mean index | Mean index | Mean index | S.D. | Ratio | Mean index | S.D. | Ratio | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 0.09 | -0.51 | 1.01 | 0.79 | 76.5 | 504.15 | 96.29 | 72.1 | 0.24 | (0.01) | 0.27 | (0.01) |
| - | Austria | 0.07 | 2.23 | -1.37 | 0.85 | 71.2 | 505.54 | 92.48 | 51.6 | -0.41 | (0.03) | -0.22 | (0.03) |
| O | Belgium | 1.00 | 0.82 | -0.78 | 0.91 | 72.4 | 514.75 | 102.29 | 49.5 | -0.37 | (0.02) | -0.22 | (0.02) |
|  | Canada | 0.38 | -0.64 | 0.62 | 0.86 | 82.8 | 518.07 | 88.86 | 80.2 | 0.25 | (0.01) | 0.27 | (0.02) |
|  | Chile | 0.78 | -0.33 | 0.36 | 1.13 | 47.2 | 422.63 | 80.75 | 56.6 | 0.32 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.02) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.13 | 1.00 | -1.55 | 0.75 | 76.4 | 498.96 | 94.94 | 48.5 | -0.17 | (0.02) | -0.15 | (0.03) |
|  | Denmark | -0.22 | -0.87 | -1.07 | 0.84 | 82.3 | 500.03 | 82.10 | 83.5 | 0.23 | (0.02) | 0.21 | (0.02) |
|  | Estonia | -0.54 | -0.66 | -0.42 | 0.81 | 81.5 | 520.55 | 80.90 | 82.7 | 0.02 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.02) |
|  | Finland | -0.59 | -0.98 | -1.06 | 0.77 | 91.1 | 518.75 | 85.29 | 92.5 | -0.01 | (0.02) | 0.04 | (0.02) |
|  | France | 0.93 | -0.03 | -0.62 | 0.80 | w | 494.98 | 97.46 | w | -0.16 | (0.02) | -0.12 | (0.03) |
|  | Germany | 0.43 | 0.52 | 0.06 | 0.93 | 73.6 | 513.53 | 96.30 | 47.0 | -0.13 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.03) |
|  | Greece | -0.19 | -0.30 | -1.77 | 1.00 | 73.5 | 452.97 | 87.79 | 67.9 | 0.02 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.03) |
|  | Hungary | 0.17 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.96 | 62.6 | 477.04 | 93.62 | 38.1 | -0.05 | (0.02) | -0.15 | (0.03) |
|  | Iceland | -1.23 | -0.84 | 0.78 | 0.81 | 86.4 | 492.80 | 91.94 | 90.1 | 0.33 | (0.02) | 0.31 | (0.02) |
|  | Ireland | 0.28 | -0.40 | 1.61 | 0.85 | 79.7 | 501.50 | 84.58 | 81.8 | 0.13 | (0.02) | 0.22 | (0.02) |
|  | Israel | -0.53 | -0.11 | 1.47 | 0.85 | 74.6 | 466.48 | 104.91 | 57.6 | 0.31 | (0.02) | 0.16 | (0.03) |
|  | Italy | -0.06 | 0.78 | -0.46 | 0.97 | 75.9 | 485.32 | 92.78 | 48.5 | -0.19 | (0.01) | -0.22 | (0.01) |
|  | Japan | -2.08 | 0.19 | -1.03 | 0.71 | 77.8 | 536.41 | 93.52 | 47.0 | -0.50 | (0.02) | -0.20 | (0.02) |
|  | Korea | -0.61 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.74 | 78.3 | 553.77 | 99.08 | 60.4 | -0.39 | (0.03) | -0.22 | (0.03) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.95 | 0.60 | -0.51 | 1.10 | 73.6 | 489.85 | 95.40 | 61.1 | -0.28 | (0.02) | -0.21 | (0.02) |
|  | Mexico | 0.61 | 0.20 | 0.47 | 1.27 | 56.5 | 413.28 | 74.27 | 64.8 | 0.51 | (0.01) | 0.23 | (0.01) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.54 | 1.22 | 1.32 | 0.78 | 81.8 | 522.97 | 91.61 | 34.1 | -0.36 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.03) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.48 | -0.50 | 0.25 | 0.82 | 77.5 | 499.75 | 99.60 | 76.2 | 0.28 | (0.02) | 0.30 | (0.03) |
|  | Norway | -0.88 | -0.95 | -0.77 | 0.76 | 91.0 | 489.37 | 90.48 | 87.1 | 0.19 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.03) |
|  | Poland | -1.44 | -0.81 | 0.26 | 0.90 | 76.4 | 517.50 | 90.37 | 79.5 | -0.14 | (0.02) | -0.23 | (0.04) |
|  | Portugal | 1.43 | -0.25 | -0.70 | 1.19 | 68.6 | 487.06 | 93.95 | 70.1 | 0.26 | (0.02) | 0.18 | (0.02) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.05 | 0.80 | -0.12 | 0.92 | 64.4 | 481.64 | 100.84 | 50.1 | -0.33 | (0.02) | -0.42 | (0.03) |
|  | Slovenia | -0.52 | 0.49 | -1.76 | 0.87 | 74.6 | 501.13 | 91.66 | 41.3 | -0.23 | (0.02) | -0.38 | (0.04) |
|  | Spain | 0.75 | -0.93 | 0.93 | 1.03 | 75.2 | 484.32 | 87.74 | 81.2 | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.02) |
|  | Sweden | -0.49 | -0.88 | 1.45 | 0.82 | 86.9 | 478.26 | 91.75 | 87.5 | 0.18 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.03) |
|  | Switzerland | 1.15 | 0.53 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 82.7 | 530.93 | 94.29 | 64.4 | -0.12 | (0.02) | -0.08 | (0.03) |
|  | Turkey | 0.17 | 0.85 | -0.04 | 1.10 | 72.3 | 447.98 | 91.07 | 38.2 | 0.06 | (0.02) | -0.15 | (0.03) |
|  | United Kingdom | -0.64 | -0.73 | 1.82 | 0.80 | 79.4 | 493.93 | 94.52 | 71.8 | 0.32 | (0.02) | 0.30 | (0.02) |
|  | United States | 0.84 | -0.68 | -0.22 | 0.97 | 73.8 | 481.37 | 89.86 | 76.3 | 0.14 | (0.02) | 0.30 | (0.02) |
|  | OECD average | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 75.7 | 494.05 | 91.86 | 64.8 | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.03) |


| 先 | Albania | 0.07 | -0.05 | 0.90 | m | m | 394.33 | 91.49 | 95.4 | 0.55 | (0.02) | 0.20 | (0.05) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 1.14 | -0.32 | 0.24 | 1.11 | 66.5 | 388.43 | 76.74 | 55.6 | 0.16 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.03) |
|  | Brazil | 4.11 | -0.51 | 1.25 | 1.17 | 62.8 | 391.46 | 77.72 | 56.9 | 0.37 | (0.01) | 0.13 | (0.02) |
|  | Bulgaria | -0.50 | 1.01 | -0.25 | 1.05 | 59.6 | 438.74 | 93.91 | 47.2 | -0.04 | (0.02) | -0.25 | (0.03) |
|  | Colombia | 2.15 | -0.05 | 0.44 | 1.18 | 63.2 | 376.49 | 74.33 | 64.9 | 0.42 | (0.02) | 0.21 | (0.02) |
|  | Costa Rica | 1.29 | 0.26 | -0.57 | 1.24 | 61.8 | 407.00 | 68.36 | 57.6 | 0.30 | (0.02) | 0.19 | (0.03) |
|  | Croatia | -0.56 | 1.36 | 1.30 | 0.85 | 75.9 | 471.13 | 88.47 | 55.7 | -0.24 | (0.02) | -0.18 | (0.03) |
|  | Cyprus* | -0.57 | -0.09 | 0.04 | 0.91 | 76.6 | 439.70 | 93.13 | 67.6 | 0.10 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.02) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.44 | -0.02 | -0.22 | 0.97 | 67.7 | 561.24 | 96.31 | 57.6 | -0.23 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.02) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.67 | 0.26 | 0.87 | 1.10 | 63.1 | 375.11 | 71.36 | 48.0 | 0.35 | (0.02) | -0.13 | (0.02) |
|  | Jordan | -0.33 | -0.08 | 1.22 | 1.02 | 79.6 | 385.60 | 77.58 | 64.0 | 0.45 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.03) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.22 | -0.19 | 1.65 | 0.75 | 76.8 | 431.80 | 71.18 | 63.5 | 0.41 | (0.03) | 0.25 | (0.03) |
|  | Latvia | -0.18 | -0.12 | 0.12 | 0.89 | 74.7 | 490.57 | 81.87 | 74.4 | 0.13 | (0.02) | 0.12 | (0.03) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 1.41 | 0.54 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 85.5 | 534.97 | 95.27 | 37.5 | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.03 | (0.10) |
|  | Lithuania | -0.41 | -0.32 | 1.63 | 0.92 | 78.7 | 478.82 | 89.11 | 69.3 | 0.27 | (0.02) | 0.03 | (0.03) |
|  | Macao-China | 1.65 | 0.28 | -1.38 | 0.87 | 73.7 | 538.13 | 94.50 | 58.2 | -0.26 | (0.02) | -0.07 | (0.02) |
|  | Malaysia | -0.19 | 0.44 | 0.36 | 0.99 | 71.5 | 420.51 | 81.11 | 67.6 | 0.53 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.02) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.60 | 0.93 | -0.50 | 0.89 | 80.6 | 409.63 | 82.67 | 63.5 | -0.29 | (0.02) | -0.36 | (0.03) |
|  | Peru | 2.31 | -0.24 | 0.47 | 1.23 | 54.2 | 368.10 | 84.36 | 54.4 | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.36 | (0.02) |
|  | Qatar | 0.82 | -0.08 | 1.78 | 0.89 | 75.5 | 376.45 | 99.86 | 53.8 | 0.29 | (0.01) | -0.18 | (0.02) |
|  | Romania | -0.73 | -0.16 | 0.76 | 0.94 | 64.4 | 444.55 | 81.34 | 54.6 | -0.57 | (0.02) | -0.72 | (0.03) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.29 | -0.48 | 1.47 | 0.76 | 75.0 | 482.17 | 86.37 | 73.2 | -0.07 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.03) |
|  | Serbia | -1.16 | 1.84 | 0.82 | 0.90 | 78.0 | 448.86 | 90.68 | 54.0 | -0.09 | (0.02) | -0.19 | (0.03) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 0.52 | 0.23 | 0.32 | 0.96 | 66.8 | 612.68 | 100.98 | 53.1 | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.33 | (0.02) |
|  | Singapore | -0.30 | 0.35 | -0.25 | 0.92 | 76.4 | 573.47 | 105.36 | 63.3 | 0.40 | (0.02) | 0.35 | (0.02) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | -0.22 | 0.43 | -0.72 | 0.84 | 76.7 | 559.82 | 115.61 | 57.9 | -0.33 | (0.02) | -0.29 | (0.03) |
|  | Thailand | -0.49 | 0.23 | -1.89 | 1.17 | 61.6 | 426.74 | 82.21 | 57.9 | 0.39 | (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.02) |
|  | Tunisia | 1.32 | 0.12 | 1.03 | 1.26 | 67.2 | 387.82 | 78.18 | 50.7 | 0.41 | (0.02) | 0.08 | (0.04) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 1.18 | 0.29 | 1.95 | 0.85 | 73.9 | 434.01 | 89.51 | 55.6 | 0.37 | (0.02) | 0.12 | (0.02) |
|  | Uruguay | 1.40 | 0.34 | -0.12 | 1.13 | 60.2 | 409.29 | 88.70 | 58.0 | 0.21 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.03) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.45 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 1.12 | 58.3 | 511.34 | 85.76 | 47.9 | 0.37 | (0.02) | 0.20 | (0.02) |

1. ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average age of entry into primary school |  |  |  | Percentage of students who started primary school at: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 years old | 5 years old |  | 6 years old |  | 7 years old |  | 8 years old or older |  |
|  |  | Mean age | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  |  |  | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.70 | (0.01) | 12.4 | (0.5) | 58.2 | (0.8) | 24.8 | (0.7) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Austria | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 70.6 | (0.9) | 22.9 | (0.9) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Belgium | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 15.2 | (0.5) | 68.1 | (0.7) | 9.5 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Canada | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.81 | (0.01) | 19.5 | (0.6) | 48.5 | (0.7) | 27.2 | (0.6) | 4.4 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 6.4 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 0.8 | (0.1) | 62.1 | (0.9) | 35.9 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Denmark | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.63 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 3.7 | (0.3) | 35.3 | (1.1) | 56.5 | (1.0) | 4.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.48 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 0.3 | (0.1) | 27.7 | (0.6) | 71.0 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.02) | 4.9 | (0.5) | 14.9 | (0.9) | 68.9 | (1.2) | 10.4 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Germany | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.55 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 62.4 | (0.9) | 34.0 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Greece | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.46 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 73.5 | (1.1) | 25.6 | (1.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Hungary | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.58 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 36.4 | (0.8) | 58.5 | (0.8) | 4.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Iceland | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.43 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 19.4 | (0.7) | 78.1 | (0.8) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Ireland | 4.4 | (0.0) | 0.57 | (0.01) | 59.8 | (1.2) | 36.2 | (1.2) | 4.1 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Italy | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.42 | (0.01) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 12.9 | (0.6) | 82.8 | (0.7) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | c | c | c | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.30 | (0.02) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 91.6 | (1.2) | 6.9 | (1.2) | 0.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.01) | 4.6 | (0.3) | 8.6 | (0.4) | 64.8 | (0.6) | 17.8 | (0.5) | 1.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.64 | (0.01) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 11.0 | (0.6) | 68.5 | (0.9) | 17.6 | (1.0) | 2.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.66 | (0.01) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 14.8 | (0.7) | 67.5 | (1.0) | 14.2 | (1.0) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.0 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.02) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 85.6 | (0.6) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | 6.5 | (0.0) | 0.65 | (0.01) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 4.0 | (0.4) | 34.0 | (1.2) | 60.1 | (1.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Poland | 7.0 | (0.0) | 0.35 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.1) | 5.2 | (0.4) | 89.1 | (0.7) | 5.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Portugal | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 22.4 | (0.7) | 66.7 | (0.9) | 10.0 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.53 | (0.01) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 64.2 | (1.2) | 33.3 | (1.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 20.4 | (0.9) | 76.1 | (0.9) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Sweden | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.55 | (0.01) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 26.2 | (1.2) | 67.6 | (1.4) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Switzerland | 6.5 | (0.0) | 0.74 | (0.02) | 1.6 | (0.3) | 4.3 | (0.4) | 35.7 | (1.0) | 49.7 | (1.3) | 4.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Turkey | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.53 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.1) | 21.1 | (1.0) | 72.4 | (1.2) | 5.2 | (1.0) |
|  | United States | 5.4 | (0.0) | 0.78 | (0.01) | 9.3 | (0.6) | 52.1 | (0.9) | 31.3 | (0.7) | 6.5 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.2) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.57 | (0.00) | 4.3 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.1) | 47.6 | (0.2) | 27.2 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \text { y } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | Brazil | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.84 | (0.02) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 6.1 | (0.5) | 30.6 | (1.0) | 54.1 | (1.2) | 7.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.77 | (0.02) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 11.6 | (0.6) | 66.0 | (1.1) | 16.8 | (0.8) | 4.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.01) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 10.0 | (0.6) | 48.9 | (1.1) | 37.8 | (1.3) | 2.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Latvia | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.58 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 26.5 | (1.0) | 66.5 | (1.0) | 5.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.62 | (0.03) | 0.0 | c | 2.2 | (0.8) | 34.6 | (2.7) | 51.0 | (2.9) | 5.1 | (1.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.89 | (0.03) | 3.0 | (0.7) | 14.4 | (1.4) | 50.7 | (1.8) | 26.2 | (1.4) | 5.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Russian Federation | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.4 | (0.1) | 24.1 | (1.4) | 68.5 | (1.5) | 6.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Thailand | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.1) | 29.4 | (1.1) | 68.4 | (1.1) | 1.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.43 | (0.01) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 8.9 | (0.6) | 83.9 | (0.8) | 5.2 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.65 | (0.01) | 3.4 | (0.4) | 25.8 | (1.0) | 63.7 | (0.9) | 6.5 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.2) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
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Table IV.2.17 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average age of entry into primary school |  |  |  | Percentage of students who started primary school at: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 years old | 5 years old |  | 6 years old |  | 7 years old |  | 8 years old or older |  |
|  |  | Mean age | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  |  |  | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.01) | 11.5 | (0.3) | 58.4 | (0.4) | 26.9 | (0.5) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Austria | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 4.2 | (0.4) | 73.6 | (0.9) | 20.8 | (0.8) | 1.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Belgium | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 18.9 | (0.6) | 70.3 | (0.6) | 8.3 | (0.4) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 5.2 | (0.0) | 0.98 | (0.03) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 49.9 | (0.7) | 27.5 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 6.4 | (0.0) | 0.55 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.2) | 61.9 | (1.0) | 34.9 | (0.9) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 36.1 | (0.7) | 53.6 | (0.7) | 7.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.48 | (0.00) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 28.8 | (0.7) | 69.9 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.80 | (0.03) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 15.9 | (0.7) | 68.9 | (0.9) | 9.4 | (0.5) | 2.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Germany | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 70.1 | (0.8) | 24.0 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Greece | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.77 | (0.06) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 4.4 | (0.4) | 70.5 | (1.4) | 23.0 | (1.3) | 2.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Hungary | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (0.8) | 57.8 | (0.8) | 5.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.51 | (0.01) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 19.5 | (0.7) | 75.7 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 4.5 | (0.0) | 0.58 | (0.01) | 56.0 | (0.9) | 39.5 | (0.9) | 4.5 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Italy | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.44 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 13.0 | (0.3) | 81.9 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 6.0 | (0.0) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 6.6 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.01) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 38.3 | (2.3) | 55.5 | (2.2) | 4.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.59 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 6.5 | (0.3) | 67.6 | (0.7) | 23.3 | (0.6) | 2.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.02) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 8.2 | (0.2) | 73.5 | (0.4) | 15.8 | (0.4) | 1.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 12.2 | (0.6) | 71.6 | (0.9) | 15.0 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.1 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.03) | 5.3 | (0.4) | 84.3 | (0.8) | 7.7 | (0.5) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.67 | (0.05) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 24.8 | (0.7) | 70.2 | (0.7) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 7.0 | (0.0) | 0.07 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Portugal | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.83 | (0.04) | 0.0 | c | 24.9 | (0.8) | 64.9 | (0.8) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 1.5 | (0.2) | 65.3 | (1.1) | 32.3 | (1.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Spain | 5.8 | (0.0) | 0.50 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 25.4 | (0.7) | 70.4 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Sweden | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.68 | (0.05) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 25.3 | (1.3) | 70.2 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 6.5 | (0.0) | 1.03 | (0.03) | 2.8 | (0.4) | 6.4 | (0.4) | 44.2 | (0.9) | 41.4 | (0.9) | 5.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Turkey | 6.9 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 17.5 | (0.7) | 74.7 | (0.8) | 6.7 | (0.5) |
|  | United States | 5.9 | (0.0) | 1.05 | (0.07) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 24.5 | (0.8) | 57.5 | (0.9) | 12.6 | (0.6) | 1.9 | (0.2) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.00) | 3.6 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 52.0 | (0.2) | 26.7 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
| 5 | Brazil | 7.2 | (0.0) | 2.28 | (0.04) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 32.4 | (0.9) | 34.3 | (1.0) | 20.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.1 | (0.0) | 0.61 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 11.1 | (0.6) | 73.3 | (1.0) | 13.3 | (0.7) | 2.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 6.3 | (0.0) | 0.65 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 8.3 | (0.9) | 54.5 | (1.4) | 35.3 | (1.6) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Latvia | 6.8 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 1.8 | (0.4) | 25.0 | (0.9) | 69.4 | (1.0) | 3.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 6.6 | (0.1) | 1.16 | (0.21) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (1.2) | 43.6 | (3.0) | 46.5 | (2.9) | 5.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Macao-China | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 12.6 | (0.5) | 61.8 | (0.7) | 22.3 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 6.7 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 36.0 | (1.6) | 60.0 | (1.6) | 3.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Thailand | 6.2 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 4.4 | (0.5) | 76.5 | (1.1) | 18.9 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.47 | (0.03) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 13.6 | (0.5) | 81.7 | (0.7) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 5.9 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 78.0 | (0.8) | 8.0 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 齐政 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
[Part 3/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in primary school starting age

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average age of entry into primary school |  |  |  | Percentage of students who started primary school at: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 years old | 5 years old |  | 6 years old |  | 7 years old |  | 8 years old or older |  |
|  |  | Mean age | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.02 | (0.01) | -0.9 | (0.6) | 0.2 | (0.9) | 2.1 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.3) | -0.4 | c |
|  | Austria | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.2 | c | -0.7 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (1.3) | -2.2 | (1.2) | 0.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Belgium | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.00 | (0.02) | -0.4 | (0.3) | 3.7 | (0.8) | 2.2 | (0.9) | -1.1 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.17 | (0.03) | -1.7 | (0.9) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 0.3 | (0.9) | -1.3 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.4 | (0.2) | -0.2 | (1.3) | -1.0 | (1.3) | 0.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.04 | (0.01) | 0.1 | c | -0.5 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (1.3) | -2.9 | (1.2) | 2.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Finland | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | -0.2 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.9) | -1.1 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | France | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.11 | (0.03) | -1.3 | (0.6) | 0.9 | (1.1) | 0.0 | (1.5) | -1.0 | (0.8) | 1.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Germany | -0.1 | (0.0) | -0.02 | (0.01) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (1.2) | -10.0 | (1.2) | -0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Greece | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.31 | (0.06) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 3.9 | (0.4) | -3.0 | (1.7) | -2.6 | (1.7) | 1.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Hungary | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (1.1) | -0.7 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.08 | (0.01) | 1.7 | c | 0.0 | (1.0) | -2.4 | (1.1) | 1.1 | (0.4) | 0.1 | c |
|  | Ireland | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.01 | (0.01) | -3.8 | (1.5) | 3.4 | (1.5) | 0.4 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Italy | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.02 | (0.01) | -0.2 | c | 0.1 | (0.7) | -0.8 | (0.8) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | c | c | c | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.31 | (0.02) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.4) | -53.3 | (2.6) | 48.7 | (2.5) | 4.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.2 | (0.0) | -0.14 | (0.01) | -4.6 | c | -2.0 | (0.5) | 2.9 | (0.9) | 5.5 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Mexico | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.09 | (0.02) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -2.8 | (0.6) | 5.0 | (1.0) | -1.8 | (1.1) | -0.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.1 | (0.0) | -0.10 | (0.02) | -2.2 | c | -2.6 | (0.9) | 4.1 | (1.4) | 0.8 | (1.1) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.09 | (0.03) | -0.5 | (0.6) | -1.4 | (1.0) | 2.7 | (0.6) | -0.2 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Norway | -0.7 | (0.0) | 0.03 | (0.05) | -1.2 | (0.2) | 20.9 | (0.8) | 36.2 | (1.4) | -56.2 | (1.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.28 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | -0.2 | c | -4.7 | (0.5) | 10.4 | (0.7) | -5.5 |  |
|  | Portugal | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.24 | (0.04) | -0.4 | c | 2.6 | (1.0) | -1.8 | (1.2) | -2.3 | (0.8) | 2.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.01 | (0.01) | -0.4 | c | 0.3 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (1.6) | -1.1 | (1.6) | 0.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 5.0 | (1.1) | -5.8 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.5) | -0.4 | c |
|  | Sweden | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.13 | (0.05) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -0.8 | (0.4) | -0.9 | (1.8) | 2.6 | (2.0) | 1.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.1 | (0.0) | 0.29 | (0.04) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 2.1 | (0.5) | 8.5 | (1.4) | -8.3 | (1.5) | 0.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Turkey | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.2) | -3.6 | (1.2) | 2.3 | (1.4) | 1.5 | (1.1) |
|  | United States | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.26 | (0.07) | -5.8 | (0.7) | -27.5 | (1.2) | 26.3 | (1.1) | 6.1 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.06 | (0.01) | -0.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.2) | -0.5 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.43 | (0.05) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.6) | 1.8 | (1.4) | -19.8 | (1.5) | 13.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.15 | (0.03) | -1.6 | , | -0.4 | (0.8) | 7.3 | (1.5) | -3.5 | (1.1) | -1.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.08 | (0.01) | -1.1 | c | -1.7 | (1.0) | 5.6 | (1.8) | -2.4 | (2.0) | -0.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Latvia | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.1 | c | 0.7 | (0.4) | -1.5 | (1.3) | 3.0 | (1.4) | -2.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.54 | (0.21) | 0.0 | c | 2.1 | (1.4) | 8.9 | (4.0) | -4.5 | (4.1) | 0.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.21 | (0.03) | -3.0 | c | -1.9 | (1.4) | 11.2 | (1.9) | -3.9 | (1.6) | -2.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.2 | (0.0) | 0.02 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.4 | (0.2) | 11.9 | (2.1) | -8.6 | (2.2) | -2.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Thailand | -0.6 | (0.0) | -0.03 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 3.8 | (0.5) | 47.1 | (1.6) | -49.6 | (1.5) | -1.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.04 | (0.03) | -0.5 | (0.1) | 4.7 | (0.8) | -2.2 | (1.1) | -0.9 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.2 | (0.0) | -0.12 | (0.02) | -1.9 | (0.4) | -13.9 | (1.1) | 14.3 | (1.2) | 1.5 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.2) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 唡政 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441

Change between 2003 and 2012 in grade repetition
Table IV.2.18 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondaryschool |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 91.8 | (0.4) | 8.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 98.7 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 9.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Austria | 96.6 | (0.6) | 3.3 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 96.2 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (0.6) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.6) | 4.0 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 10.2 | (1.0) |
|  | Belgium | 82.3 | (0.7) | 16.1 | (0.6) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 91.3 | (0.4) | 8.4 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 90.6 | (0.5) | 9.4 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 30.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Canada | 94.1 | (0.3) | 5.3 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 94.2 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 10.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 98.5 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 98.7 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 97.1 | (0.3) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 97.6 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | (0.3) |
|  | France | 82.7 | (1.0) | 16.3 | (0.9) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 70.4 | (1.2) | 28.6 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 39.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Germany | 90.2 | (0.7) | 9.5 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 84.9 | (0.7) | 14.4 | (0.7) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 21.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 94.0 | (0.7) | 5.2 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 7.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Hungary | 95.8 | (0.4) | 3.7 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 96.4 | (0.4) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 96.9 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 9.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Ireland | 86.3 | (0.7) | 13.4 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 14.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Italy | 98.4 | (0.4) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 94.0 | (0.6) | 5.4 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 90.8 | (0.5) | 9.1 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 15.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | , | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 99.9 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 82.3 | (0.5) | 15.0 | (0.5) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 71.0 | (0.5) | 28.4 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 38.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Mexico | 75.4 | (1.6) | 21.8 | (1.4) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 91.5 | (0.9) | 8.1 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 97.0 | (0.5) | 2.9 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 29.7 | (1.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 77.6 | (1.0) | 21.8 | (1.0) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 89.3 | (0.8) | 10.7 | (0.8) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 29.5 | (1.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 96.6 | (0.3) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.6 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 4.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Norway | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Poland | 97.6 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.3 | (0.3) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Portugal | 80.7 | (1.8) | 15.0 | (1.7) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 80.8 | (1.3) | 15.8 | (1.1) | 3.4 | (0.4) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 30.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 98.4 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Spain | 93.6 | (0.5) | 6.2 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 74.7 | (1.0) | 25.1 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 29.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Sweden | 97.2 | (0.4) | 2.8 | (0.4) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 85.1 | (0.8) | 14.3 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 90.7 | (0.7) | 9.2 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | , | 22.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Turkey | 94.1 | (1.1) | 5.3 | (0.9) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 95.2 | (0.9) | 4.6 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 88.5 | (1.1) | 11.5 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 18.0 | (1.5) |
|  | United States | 91.9 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 95.8 | (0.6) | 3.9 | (0.6) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 11.6 | (0.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 85.5 | (0.1) | 6.9 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 86.2 | (0.1) | 6.5 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 64.0 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Brazil | 77.5 | (1.2) | 19.5 | (1.1) | 3.1 | (0.4) | 81.0 | (1.2) | 15.6 | (1.0) | 3.4 | (0.4) | 97.6 | (0.4) | 2.4 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 33.1 | (1.4) |
| \% | Hong Kong-China | 87.2 | (0.6) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 94.6 | (0.4) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 16.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 84.6 | (0.9) | 14.6 | (0.9) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 98.5 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Latvia | 94.2 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.4 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 7.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 91.5 | (1.5) | 8.5 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 88.0 | (1.5) | 11.7 | (1.6) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 18.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 67.6 | (1.4) | 24.6 | (1.6) | 7.8 | (0.9) | 67.0 | (1.6) | 27.3 | (1.5) | 5.6 | (0.8) | 98.1 | (0.9) | 1.9 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | 49.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 97.7 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Thailand | 99.6 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 1.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 47.5 | (1.4) | 34.0 | (1.1) | 18.4 | (0.9) | 58.5 | (1.6) | 36.1 | (1.4) | 5.3 | (0.5) | 98.8 | (0.4) | 1.2 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 61.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 79.6 | (1.4) | 15.8 | (1.1) | 4.6 | (0.5) | 78.0 | (1.4) | 17.8 | (1.1) | 4.2 | (0.5) | 98.6 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 33.6 | (1.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink (-insta http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
[Part 2/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in grade repetition
Table IV.2.18 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Twice } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| 8 | Australia | 93.3 | (0.2) | 6.4 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 7.5 | (0.3) |
| نِّ | Austria | 94.9 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 95.1 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 96.4 | (0.3) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 11.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Belgium | 79.5 | (0.7) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 83.3 | (0.6) | 15.5 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 90.9 | (0.4) | 9.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 36.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Canada | 95.8 | (0.2) | 3.9 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 95.6 | (0.2) | 3.8 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 8.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Czech Republic | 97.9 | (0.4) | 1.9 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 96.7 | (0.4) | 3.0 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Denmark | 96.0 | (0.4) | 3.9 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 96.8 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.8 | (0.4) |
|  | France | 83.0 | (0.7) | 16.5 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 85.6 | (0.7) | 13.9 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 28.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Germany | 89.8 | (0.6) | 9.6 | (0.6) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 87.2 | (0.6) | 12.3 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 20.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Greece | 98.5 | (0.3) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 96.1 | (0.7) | 2.8 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Hungary | 95.1 | (0.6) | 4.2 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 94.3 | (0.7) | 4.2 | (0.5) | 1.5 | (0.4) | 97.3 | (0.3) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 10.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Iceland | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 92.1 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.9 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 8.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Italy | 99.0 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 92.6 | (0.3) | 6.1 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 89.7 | (0.4) | 10.2 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 17.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 96.8 | (0.2) | 2.4 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 96.9 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 97.8 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 78.5 | (0.5) | 19.3 | (0.5) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 80.7 | (0.6) | 18.5 | (0.6) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 34.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Mexico | 87.4 | (0.5) | 11.2 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 96.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 98.9 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 15.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 79.1 | (1.1) | 20.2 | (1.0) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 92.1 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 27.6 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 96.0 | (0.3) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.2 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 5.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Norway | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Poland | 98.6 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.8 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Portugal | 76.7 | (1.5) | 17.9 | (1.2) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 80.2 | (1.5) | 17.5 | (1.4) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 34.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 95.1 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 96.6 | (0.4) | 2.9 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 7.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Spain | 86.2 | (0.5) | 12.9 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 72.3 | (0.7) | 25.0 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 32.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Sweden | 96.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | (1.1) | 4.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 86.8 | (0.7) | 12.7 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 91.9 | (0.5) | 7.9 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 19.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Turkey | 97.7 | (0.3) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 87.0 | (0.8) | 12.9 | (0.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 14.2 | (0.9) |
|  | United States | 88.9 | (0.9) | 10.7 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.3) | 4.0 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 97.9 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.3 | (1.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 85.4 | (0.1) | 7.0 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 83.4 | (0.1) | 5.7 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 70.7 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 79.4 | (0.7) | 15.9 | (0.6) | 4.7 | (0.4) | 80.6 | (0.8) | 14.5 | (0.6) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 92.3 | (0.4) | 7.4 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (1.0) |
| E | Hong Kong-China | 90.7 | (0.5) | 8.5 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 92.4 | (0.5) | 7.2 | (0.5) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 15.9 | (0.7) |
| ๕ | Indonesia | 85.4 | (1.2) | 13.3 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 95.0 | (0.6) | 4.4 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 96.2 | (0.6) | 3.5 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 15.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Latvia | 94.4 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 96.3 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.6) | 8.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 89.0 | (1.7) | 11.0 | (1.7) | 0.0 | c | 90.6 | (1.5) | 9.4 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 18.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 77.0 | (0.4) | 17.0 | (0.4) | 6.0 | (0.3) | 70.5 | (0.5) | 25.0 | (0.5) | 4.5 | (0.2) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 41.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 98.3 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Thailand | 98.1 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 99.0 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 3.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 82.2 | (1.8) | 12.7 | (1.2) | 5.1 | (0.7) | 69.6 | (2.4) | 23.8 | (1.8) | 6.6 | (0.7) | 97.4 | (0.3) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 38.7 | (2.8) |
|  | Uruguay | 78.4 | (1.0) | 17.4 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.4) | 72.9 | (1.2) | 20.7 | (0.9) | 6.4 | (0.6) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 37.9 | (1.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink nillsta http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441

Change between 2003 and 2012 in grade repetition
Table IV.2.18 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| 8 | Australia | 1.5 | (0.5) | -1.6 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) | -0.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | -1.7 | (0.5) |
| - | Austria | -1.7 | (0.7) | 1.7 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -1.1 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.7) | -0.4 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Belgium | -2.7 | (1.0) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 1.1 | (0.3) | -8.0 | (0.7) | 7.2 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.6) | -0.4 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 5.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Canada | 1.7 | (0.4) | -1.4 | (0.4) | -0.3 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.4) | -1.3 | (0.4) | -0.1 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -2.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.6 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -2.0 | (0.5) | 1.7 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Denmark | -1.1 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -0.2 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Finland | -0.8 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.0 | (0.5) |
|  | France | 0.3 | (1.2) | 0.2 | (1.2) | -0.5 | (0.2) | 15.2 | (1.4) | -14.7 | (1.3) | -0.6 | (0.2) | 99.5 | c | 0.5 | c | 0.0 | c | -11.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Germany | -0.4 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.9) | -2.0 | (0.9) | -0.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | -1.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Greece | -0.8 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (1.0) | -2.4 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.3) | -99.1 | c | -0.9 | c | 0.0 | c | -2.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Hungary | -0.7 | (0.7) | 0.5 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.2) | -2.1 | (0.8) | 1.1 | (0.6) | 1.0 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.4) | -0.4 | (0.4) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Iceland | -0.7 | c | 0.5 | c | 0.2 | c | -0.8 | c | 0.6 | c | 0.2 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | c |
|  | Ireland | 5.8 | (0.8) | -5.6 | (0.8) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.3) | -0.2 | (0.3) | 0.1 | c | 0.1 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | -5.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Italy | 0.6 | (0.4) | -0.3 | (0.3) | -0.3 | (0.2) | -1.4 | (0.7) | 0.7 | (0.6) | 0.8 | (0.3) | -1.1 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | -3.0 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.8 | c | -2.8 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.9 | c | -2.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.5 | c | 3.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | -3.8 | (0.7) | 4.3 | (0.7) | -0.4 | (0.3) | 9.8 | (0.8) | -9.9 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.2) | -0.8 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.3 | c | -4.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Mexico | 12.1 | (1.7) | -10.7 | (1.5) | -1.4 | (0.4) | 5.1 | (0.9) | -5.0 | (0.9) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.5) | -2.0 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.0) | -14.2 | (1.8) |
|  | Netherlands | 1.6 | (1.4) | -1.7 | (1.4) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (1.0) | -2.9 | (1.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.7 | c | 0.3 | c | 0.0 | c | -1.9 | (1.4) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.6 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Norway | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Poland | 0.9 | (0.4) | -0.9 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Portugal | -4.0 | (2.4) | 2.9 | (2.0) | 1.1 | (0.8) | -0.6 | (2.0) | 1.7 | (1.8) | -1.1 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 4.1 | (2.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -3.4 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.3) | -2.2 | (0.5) | 1.9 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 99.5 | c | 0.2 | c | 0.3 | C | 5.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Spain | -7.3 | (0.7) | 6.7 | (0.6) | 0.6 | (0.2) | -2.4 | (1.2) | -0.1 | (1.1) | 2.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 3.9 | (1.2) |
|  | Sweden | -0.5 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | -0.5 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 0.2 | c | -1.3 | c | 0.0 | C | 1.3 | c | 0.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 1.7 | (1.1) | -1.5 | (1.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) | -1.3 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.3) | -0.1 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | -2.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 3.6 | (1.1) | -3.0 | (0.9) | -0.6 | (0.3) | -95.2 | c | -4.6 | c | -0.2 | c | -1.5 | (1.4) | 1.4 | (1.4) | 0.1 | c | -3.8 | (1.7) |
|  | United States | -3.0 | (1.1) | 2.9 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.7) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -1.4 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.2 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | -2.8 | (0.2) | -0.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 6.7 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | -0.5 | (0.2) |


| © | Brazil | 1.9 | (1.4) | -3.6 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (0.6) | -0.5 | (1.5) | -1.1 | (1.2) | 1.6 | (0.5) | -5.3 | (0.6) | 4.9 | (0.6) | 0.4 | c | 2.9 | (1.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 3.5 | (0.8) | -3.4 | (0.8) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -2.2 | (0.7) | 2.3 | (0.7) | -0.1 | (0.1) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | -0.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.8 | (1.5) | -1.4 | (1.4) | 0.6 | (0.2) | -3.5 | (0.7) | 3.1 | (0.5) | 0.4 | (0.2) | -3.6 | (0.6) | 3.3 | (0.6) | 0.3 | c | -0.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Latvia | 0.2 | (0.7) | -0.5 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.2) | -2.1 | (0.5) | 2.1 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | -0.6 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | c | 1.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -2.5 | (2.3) | 2.5 | (2.3) | 0.0 | c | 2.7 | (2.1) | -2.3 | (2.2) | -0.3 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Macao-China | 9.4 | (1.4) | -7.6 | (1.6) | -1.8 | (1.0) | 3.4 | (1.7) | -2.3 | (1.6) | -1.1 | (0.9) | 1.3 | (0.9) | -1.3 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | -8.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.6 | (0.4) | -0.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) | -0.2 | (0.3) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | -0.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Thailand | -1.5 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 0.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.2) | -0.1 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 1.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Tunisia | 34.7 | (2.3) | -21.3 | (1.6) | -13.4 | (1.1) | 11.1 | (2.9) | -12.4 | (2.3) | 1.3 | (0.9) | -1.4 | (0.5) | 1.4 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | -23.1 | (3.1) |
|  | Uruguay | -1.2 | (1.7) | 1.6 | (1.4) | -0.4 | (0.6) | -5.1 | (1.9) | 2.9 | (1.4) | 2.1 | (0.8) | 1.1 | (0.3) | -1.2 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (2.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in the concentration of grade repetition
Table IV.2.19 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools where the following percentage of students have repeated a grade in primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Over 30\% |  | More <br> than $10 \%$ <br> but 30\% <br> or less |  | More than $0 \%$ but 10\% or less |  | 0\% |  | Over 30\% |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { More } \\ \text { than 10\% } \\ \text { but 30\% } \\ \text { or less } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | More than 0\% but 10\% or less |  | 0\% |  | Over 30\% |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { More } \\ \text { than } 10 \% \\ \text { but } 30 \% \\ \text { or less } \end{gathered}$ |  | More than 0\% but 10\% or less |  | 0\% |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 2.1 | (1.6) | 32.2 | (2.7) | 58.8 | (3.1) | 6.9 | (1.7) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 33.3 | (1.9) | 40.8 | (1.7) | 25.0 | (1.5) | -1.2 | (1.6) | 1.1 | (3.3) | -18.0 | (3.6) | 18.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Austria | 7.1 | (1.7) | 19.4 | (2.8) | 39.3 | (3.4) | 34.2 | (2.8) | 6.7 | (1.3) | 31.8 | (3.8) | 49.9 | (4.0) | 11.6 | (2.2) | -0.5 | (2.1) | 12.4 | (4.8) | 10.6 | (5.3) | -22.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Belgium | 46.8 | (1.7) | 31.6 | (1.8) | 15.7 | (1.6) | 5.8 | (1.2) | 55.7 | (2.1) | 27.0 | (2.4) | 14.6 | (1.7) | 2.7 | (0.9) | 8.8 | (2.7) | -4.6 | (3.0) | -1.1 | (2.3) | -3.2 | (1.5) |
|  | Canada | 8.7 | (1.2) | 26.0 | (2.1) | 30.3 | (2.1) | 35.0 | (2.3) | 6.9 | (1.0) | 17.9 | (1.4) | 37.6 | (2.3) | 37.6 | (2.2) | -1.8 | (1.5) | -8.1 | (2.5) | 7.3 | (3.1) | 2.6 | (3.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.7 | (0.4) | 8.5 | (1.8) | 16.7 | (2.2) | 74.2 | (2.2) | 3.2 | (1.0) | 14.3 | (2.6) | 18.1 | (2.9) | 64.4 | (3.1) | 2.5 | (1.1) | 5.9 | (3.2) | 1.5 | (3.6) | -9.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Denmark | 0.5 | (0.4) | 9.2 | (2.0) | 35.9 | (3.4) | 54.4 | (3.9) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 14.3 | (2.5) | 44.5 | (3.6) | 40.6 | (3.5) | 0.2 | (0.6) | 5.1 | (3.2) | 8.6 | (5.0) | -13.8 | (5.3) |
|  | Finland | 0.0 |  | 3.0 | (1.4) | 48.8 | (4.0) | 48.2 | (4.0) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 7.2 | (1.8) | 56.6 | (3.0) | 35.3 | (2.9) | 0.9 | c | 4.2 | (2.3) | 7.7 | (5.0) | -12.8 | (4.9) |
|  | France | 42.3 | (1.6) | 5.3 | (1.7) | 10.0 | (2.0) | 42.5 | (2.4) | 31.6 | (1.5) | 5.7 | (1.7) | 14.9 | (2.3) | 47.7 | (2.4) | -10.6 | (2.2) | 0.4 | (2.4) | 5.0 | (3.1) | 5.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Germany | 30.3 | (2.9) | 43.6 | (3.1) | 19.1 | (2.9) | 7.1 | (1.2) | 27.2 | (2.1) | 39.5 | (3.0) | 21.0 | (2.5) | 12.3 | (2.1) | -3.1 | (3.6) | -4.1 | (4.3) | 2.0 | (3.8) | 5.2 | (2.4) |
|  | Greece | 7.3 | (1.1) | 9.3 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (5.1) | 46.5 | (4.8) | 5.0 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 25.5 | (3.8) | 68.8 | (3.8) | -2.3 | (1.6) | -8.7 | (2.7) | -11.4 | (6.3) | 22.3 | (6.1) |
|  | Hungary | 6.0 | (0.6) | 15.9 | (2.5) | 46.4 | (3.4) | 31.7 | (2.8) | 9.5 | (1.0) | 12.9 | (1.8) | 30.5 | (3.5) | 47.1 | (3.6) | 3.5 | (1.2) | -3.0 | (3.1) | -15.8 | (4.8) | 15.3 | (4.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.1) | 35.2 | (0.2) | 64.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 |  | 35.2 |  | -35.7 | c |
|  | Ireland | 9.0 | (2.3) | 54.3 | (4.0) | 28.5 | (3.7) | 8.2 | (2.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 39.5 | (3.9) | 46.8 | (3.9) | 13.6 | (2.8) | -8.9 | (2.3) | -14.8 | (5.6) | 18.3 | (5.4) | 5.4 | (3.7) |
|  | Italy | 14.8 | (2.1) | 37.5 | (3.1) | 29.1 | (2.8) | 18.7 | (2.3) | 17.1 | (1.4) | 37.9 | (1.7) | 29.4 | (1.6) | 15.6 | (1.6) | 2.3 | (2.5) | 0.4 | (3.5) | 0.3 | (3.2) | -3.0 | (2.8) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 9.0 | (2.2) | 90.1 | (2.2) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 5.1 | (1.3) | 59.8 | (3.7) | 35.0 | (3.8) | 0.0 | (0.2) | 4.3 | (1.4) | 50.8 | (4.3) | -55.1 | (4.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 69.1 | (0.0) | 21.2 | (0.0) | 9.3 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 60.0 | (0.1) | 30.5 | (0.1) | 9.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | -9.1 | (0.1) | 9.3 | (0.1) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 43.9 | (3.2) | 15.3 | (2.8) | 16.7 | (1.6) | 24.0 | (1.9) | 22.1 | (1.2) | 13.8 | (1.3) | 17.7 | (1.3) | 46.4 | (1.3) | -21.8 | (3.5) | -1.6 | (3.1) | 1.0 | (2.1) | 22.3 | (2.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 52.4 | (3.9) | 35.6 | (3.8) | 8.0 | (2.0) | 4.0 | (1.5) | 40.8 | (3.5) | 48.6 | (4.0) | 10.6 | (2.4) | 0.0 |  | -11.6 | (5.3) | 13.0 | (5.5) | 2.6 | (3.1) | -4.0 | c |
|  | New Zealand | 0.2 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (2.1) | 63.2 | (3.1) | 26.0 | (3.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 13.1 | (2.2) | 61.1 | (3.8) | 25.7 | (3.3) | -0.1 | (0.2) | 2.5 | (3.1) | -2.1 | (5.0) | -0.4 | (4.5) |
|  | Norway | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Poland | 0.0 |  | 8.1 | (2.3) | 45.9 | (3.6) | 46.0 | (3.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 12.6 | (2.5) | 46.4 | (3.9) | 41.0 | (4.1) | 0.1 | c | 4.5 | (3.4) | 0.5 | (5.3) | -5.0 | (5.6) |
|  | Portugal | 32.2 | (3.1) | 29.8 | (3.7) | 20.2 | (3.8) | 17.9 | (3.3) | 45.6 | (3.6) | 29.1 | (4.1) | 12.6 | (2.9) | 12.7 | (2.8) | 13.4 | (4.7) | -0.7 | (5.5) | -7.5 | (4.8) | -5.1 | (4.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 1.7 | (0.7) | 5.5 | (1.2) | 14.1 | (1.8) | 78.6 | (2.0) | 6.8 | (0.9) | 16.3 | (2.4) | 19.1 | (3.0) | 57.8 | (3.3) | 5.0 | (1.1) | 10.8 | (2.7) | 5.0 | (3.5) | -20.8 | (3.9) |
|  | Spain | 47.4 | (3.2) | 36.8 | (3.4) | 8.3 | (1.7) | 7.4 | (1.7) | 57.6 | (2.2) | 34.5 | (2.5) | 4.8 | (1.0) | 3.2 | (0.9) | 10.1 | (3.9) | -2.4 | (4.3) | -3.5 | (2.0) | -4.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Sweden | 1.0 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (1.8) | 48.0 | (3.7) | 45.5 | (3.8) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 7.3 | (2.0) | 44.2 | (3.7) | 47.5 | (3.7) | 0.1 | (0.9) | 1.8 | (2.7) | -3.9 | (5.2) | 2.0 | (5.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 25.9 | (2.9) | 46.2 | (3.5) | 13.5 | (2.9) | 14.4 | (1.9) | 26.5 | (2.4) | 36.3 | (2.7) | 17.0 | (2.7) | 20.2 | (2.0) | 0.6 | (3.8) | -9.8 | (4.4) | 3.4 | (4.0) | 5.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Turkey | 16.6 | (3.1) | 44.5 | (4.1) | 22.4 | (3.3) | 16.5 | (3.3) | 11.2 | (2.6) | 46.7 | (3.5) | 21.1 | (3.2) | 21.1 | (3.2) | -5.5 | (4.0) | 2.2 | (5.4) | -1.3 | (4.6) | 4.6 | (4.6) |
|  | United States | 8.0 | (1.6) | 33.9 | (3.0) | 32.8 | (3.2) | 25.3 | (2.5) | 7.9 | (2.9) | 40.9 | (4.6) | 43.5 | (4.7) | 7.7 | (2.1) | -0.1 | (3.3) | 7.0 | (5.5) | 10.7 | (5.6) | -17.6 | (3.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 16.4 | (0.4) | 20.3 | (0.5) | 25.1 | (0.6) | 31.4 | (0.5) | 15.4 | (0.3) | 21.3 | (0.5) | 28.7 | (0.6) | 27.8 | (0.5) | -1.0 | (0.5) | 1.0 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (0.8) | -3.6 | (0.8) |


| 坒 | Brazil | 48.1 | (3.0) | 30.7 | (2.8) | 14.5 | (2.5) | 6.7 | (1.8) | 52.4 | (2.6) | 37.7 | (2.7) | 7.6 | (1.3) | 2.3 | (1.1) | 4.3 | (4.0) | 7.0 | (3.8) | -6.9 | (2.9) | -4.4 | (2.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 7.7 | (2.7) | 61.8 | (4.1) | 29.9 | (3.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 9.8 | (2.6) | 59.0 | (4.1) | 25.5 | (3.7) | 5.7 | (1.9) | 2.1 | (3.8) | -2.8 | (5.8) | -4.4 | (4.9) | 5.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 21.3 | (3.0) | 30.6 | (3.8) | 23.6 | (2.9) | 24.4 | (2.6) | 17.5 | (2.9) | 25.6 | (3.6) | 41.0 | (3.8) | 15.8 | (2.4) | -3.8 | (4.2) | -5.0 | (5.2) | 17.4 | (4.8) | -8.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Latvia | 3.2 | (1.3) | 23.8 | (4.0) | 38.3 | (3.9) | 34.7 | (4.0) | 5.6 | (1.5) | 22.6 | (3.1) | 34.3 | (3.4) | 37.5 | (2.9) | 2.5 | (2.0) | -1.2 | (5.0) | -4.0 | (5.2) | 2.7 | (4.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 15.7 | (0.4) | 44.7 | (0.5) | 37.6 | (0.4) | 2.1 | (0.0) | 31.0 | (0.9) | 31.1 | (1.3) | 34.1 | (0.4) | 3.9 | (0.6) | 15.3 | (1.0) | -13.6 | (1.4) | -3.5 | (0.6) | 1.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Macao-China | 84.3 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 67.5 | (0.0) | 31.7 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.0 |  | -16.8 | (0.1) | 16.0 | (0.1) | 0.8 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.6 | (0.6) | 8.2 | (1.9) | 36.8 | (3.4) | 54.3 | (3.2) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 7.3 | (2.2) | 26.7 | (2.9) | 65.6 | (2.9) | -0.3 | (0.6) | -1.0 | (2.9) | -10.1 | (4.5) | 11.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Thailand | 0.0 | c | 2.9 | (1.2) | 29.1 | (3.6) | 68.0 | (3.7) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 7.5 | (1.9) | 44.1 | (3.9) | 47.9 | (3.6) | 0.5 | c | 4.7 | (2.2) | 14.9 | (5.3 | 20.1 | (5.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 67.2 | (1.7) | 7.4 | (2.2) | 17.6 | (3.0) | 7.8 | (2.4) | 38.2 | (3.1) | 11.2 | (2.5) | 39.0 | (3.8) | 11.6 | (2.6) | -29.0 | (3.6) | 3.8 | (3.4) | 21.4 | (4.9) | 3.8 | (3.5) |
|  | Uruguay | 35.5 | (2.3) | 16.9 | (3.6) | 31.1 | (3.5) | 16.4 | (3.6) | 48.6 | (2.4) | 18.8 | (2.4) | 10.5 | (2.0) | 22.0 | (2.3) | 13.1 | (3.3) | 1.8 | (4.3) | -20.5 | (4.0) | 5.6 | (4.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 可ilist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
[Part 1/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in student grade level
Table IV.2.20 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students at: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students enrolled in: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grades below the modal grade |  | The modal grade |  | Grades above the modal grade |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| 8 | Australia | 8.5 | (0.4) | 72.3 | (0.7) | 19.3 | (0.7) | 80.7 | (0.7) | 19.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Austria | 48.5 | (1.6) | 51.5 | (1.6) | 0.0 | c | 5.6 | (1.0) | 94.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Belgium | 33.7 | (0.7) | 65.5 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.4) | 95.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Canada | 16.8 | (0.6) | 82.0 | (0.6) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 16.8 | (0.6) | 83.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 47.6 | (1.1) | 52.4 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 48.3 | (1.2) | 51.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Denmark | 9.2 | (0.6) | 87.0 | (0.8) | 3.9 | (0.7) | 98.4 | (0.4) | 1.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 12.7 | (0.5) | 87.3 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | France | 40.4 | (1.1) | 57.3 | (1.1) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 40.4 | (1.1) | 59.6 | (1.1) |
|  | Germany | 16.7 | (0.8) | 59.9 | (0.7) | 23.4 | (0.6) | 98.3 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Greece | 8.9 | (1.3) | 76.1 | (1.4) | 15.0 | (0.9) | 8.9 | (1.3) | 91.1 | (1.3) |
|  | Hungary | 6.1 | (0.5) | 65.1 | (0.7) | 28.8 | (0.6) | 6.1 | (0.5) | 93.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Ireland | 2.8 | (0.3) | 60.9 | (1.3) | 36.3 | (1.4) | 63.7 | (1.4) | 36.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Italy | 15.8 | (0.7) | 80.0 | (0.8) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 1.6 | (0.4) | 98.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 1.6 | (0.2) | 98.3 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 98.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 14.9 | (0.2) | 55.8 | (0.2) | 29.4 | (0.2) | 70.6 | (0.2) | 29.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | 55.3 | (2.9) | 43.7 | (2.8) | 1.0 | (0.5) | 56.3 | (2.7) | 43.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 50.2 | (1.3) | 49.3 | (1.3) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 74.8 | (1.2) | 25.2 | (1.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 6.9 | (0.5) | 89.4 | (0.5) | 3.8 | (0.2) | 6.9 | (0.5) | 93.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Norway | 0.6 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 3.8 | (0.4) | 95.7 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Portugal | 35.1 | (2.4) | 64.3 | (2.4) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 35.1 | (2.4) | 64.9 | (2.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 38.6 | (1.5) | 60.9 | (1.5) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 35.7 | (1.5) | 64.3 | (1.5) |
|  | Spain | 30.2 | (1.0) | 69.7 | (1.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Sweden | 2.4 | (0.2) | 93.0 | (1.0) | 4.6 | (0.9) | 95.5 | (0.9) | 4.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 17.7 | (1.1) | 62.8 | (2.1) | 19.6 | (2.5) | 82.9 | (2.7) | 17.1 | (2.7) |
|  | Turkey | 8.4 | (1.9) | 52.1 | (2.2) | 39.4 | (2.4) | 5.2 | (1.8) | 94.8 | (1.8) |
|  | United States | 32.4 | (1.6) | 60.6 | (1.3) | 7.0 | (0.9) | 32.4 | (1.6) | 67.6 | (1.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 19.5 | (0.2) | 72.1 | (0.2) | 8.4 | (0.2) | 50.7 | (0.2) | 49.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Brazil | 38.5 | (2.6) | 42.9 | (1.9) | 18.6 | (1.1) | 38.5 | (2.6) | 61.5 | (2.6) |
| n | Hong Kong-China | 41.6 | (1.0) | 58.4 | (1.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 41.6 | (1.0) | 58.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 15.1 | (1.0) | 48.8 | (1.7) | 36.1 | (2.0) | 63.9 | (2.0) | 36.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Latvia | 17.8 | (0.8) | 76.0 | (0.8) | 6.2 | (0.5) | 93.8 | (0.5) | 6.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 21.0 | (0.9) | 71.3 | (0.9) | 7.8 | (0.2) | 94.3 | (0.2) | 5.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 38.2 | (0.6) | 36.8 | (0.7) | 25.0 | (0.5) | 75.0 | (0.5) | 25.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | 31.7 | (2.1) | 67.2 | (2.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 31.7 | (2.1) | 68.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Thailand | 45.3 | (1.3) | 53.3 | (1.2) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 45.3 | (1.3) | 54.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 62.5 | (1.4) | 34.5 | (1.4) | 2.9 | (0.2) | 62.5 | (1.4) | 37.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 33.6 | (2.0) | 59.4 | (1.7) | 7.1 | (1.0) | 33.6 | (2.0) | 66.4 | (2.0) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[Part 2/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in student grade level
Table IV.2.20 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students at: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students enrolled in: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grades below the modal grade |  | The modal grade |  | Grades above the modal grade |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 10.9 | (0.5) | 70.0 | (0.6) | 19.1 | (0.4) | 80.9 | (0.4) | 19.1 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | 49.0 | (1.0) | 51.0 | (1.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 5.6 | (0.7) | 94.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Belgium | 38.2 | (0.6) | 60.8 | (0.6) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 10.3 | (0.6) | 89.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Canada | 14.4 | (0.6) | 84.6 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 14.4 | (0.6) | 85.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 4.9 | (0.5) | 51.1 | (1.2) | 44.1 | (1.3) | 56.1 | (1.2) | 43.9 | (1.2) |
|  | Denmark | 18.3 | (0.9) | 80.6 | (0.8) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Finland | 14.9 | (0.4) | 85.0 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 29.8 | (0.7) | 66.6 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 29.8 | (0.7) | 70.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Germany | 10.6 | (0.6) | 51.9 | (0.8) | 37.5 | (0.9) | 97.6 | (0.8) | 2.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Greece | 5.5 | (1.0) | 94.5 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c | 5.5 | (1.0) | 94.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Hungary | 11.6 | (0.9) | 67.8 | (0.9) | 20.6 | (0.6) | 11.6 | (0.9) | 88.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Ireland | 1.9 | (0.2) | 60.5 | (0.8) | 37.6 | (0.8) | 62.4 | (0.8) | 37.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Italy | 18.9 | (0.6) | 78.5 | (0.7) | 2.6 | (0.2) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 97.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | C |
|  | Korea | 5.9 | (0.8) | 93.8 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 5.9 | (0.8) | 94.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 10.9 | (0.2) | 50.7 | (0.1) | 38.5 | (0.1) | 60.0 | (0.1) | 40.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 37.0 | (1.1) | 60.8 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 37.0 | (1.1) | 63.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 3.6 | (0.4) | 46.7 | (1.0) | 49.7 | (1.1) | 70.3 | (1.6) | 29.7 | (1.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 6.3 | (0.4) | 88.3 | (0.5) | 5.4 | (0.4) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 93.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Norway | 0.4 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 99.8 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Poland | 4.6 | (0.4) | 94.9 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Portugal | 39.2 | (2.1) | 60.5 | (2.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 44.9 | (2.3) | 55.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 45.7 | (1.4) | 52.7 | (1.4) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 45.2 | (1.4) | 54.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Spain | 34.0 | (0.6) | 66.0 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Sweden | 3.7 | (0.3) | 94.0 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.5) | 97.8 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 13.5 | (0.8) | 60.6 | (1.0) | 25.9 | (1.0) | 76.8 | (1.2) | 23.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Turkey | 30.3 | (1.2) | 65.5 | (1.2) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.4) | 97.3 | (0.4) |
|  | United States | 12.0 | (1.1) | 71.2 | (1.1) | 16.8 | (0.8) | 12.0 | (1.1) | 88.0 | (1.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 16.4 | (0.2) | 72.7 | (0.2) | 10.9 | (0.1) | 49.4 | (0.2) | 50.6 | (0.2) |
| © | Brazil | 20.4 | (1.1) | 34.9 | (1.0) | 44.6 | (1.0) | 20.4 | (1.1) | 79.6 | (1.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 33.5 | (1.0) | 65.0 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (1.4) | 33.5 | (1.0) | 66.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 47.9 | (3.3) | 47.7 | (3.0) | 4.4 | (0.8) | 47.9 | (3.3) | 52.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Latvia | 16.9 | (0.8) | 80.0 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.4) | 96.1 | (0.7) | 3.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 19.0 | (1.4) | 66.3 | (1.3) | 14.6 | (0.2) | 88.2 | (0.2) | 11.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 21.7 | (0.1) | 33.2 | (0.2) | 45.1 | (0.1) | 54.9 | (0.1) | 45.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 8.7 | (0.5) | 73.8 | (1.6) | 17.5 | (1.8) | 82.5 | (1.8) | 17.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Thailand | 21.1 | (1.0) | 76.0 | (1.1) | 2.9 | (0.5) | 21.1 | (1.0) | 78.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Tunisia | 37.4 | (3.0) | 56.7 | (2.7) | 5.9 | (0.5) | 37.4 | (3.0) | 62.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 41.4 | (1.5) | 57.3 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 41.4 | (1.5) | 58.6 | (1.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink (ainा
[Part 3/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in student grade level
Table IV.2.20 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students at: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students enrolled in: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grades below the modal grade |  | The modal grade |  | Grades above the modal grade |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 2.4 | (0.7) | -2.3 | (0.9) | -0.1 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.8) | -0.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Austria | 0.4 | (1.9) | -0.5 | (1.9) | 0.1 | c | 0.0 | (1.3) | 0.0 | (1.3) |
|  | Belgium | 4.5 | (0.9) | -4.7 | (0.9) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 5.9 | (0.8) | -5.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Canada | -2.4 | (0.8) | 2.5 | (0.8) | -0.1 | (0.2) | -2.4 | (0.8) | 2.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | -42.8 | (1.2) | -1.3 | (1.7) | 44.1 | c | 7.9 | (1.7) | -7.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Denmark | 9.2 | (1.0) | -6.3 | (1.2) | -2.8 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.5) | -1.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Finland | 2.2 | (0.7) | -2.3 | (0.7) | 0.1 | c | -0.1 | c | 0.1 | c |
|  | France | -10.6 | (1.4) | 9.3 | (1.3) | 1.3 | (0.4) | -10.6 | (1.4) | 10.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Germany | -6.1 | (1.0) | -8.0 | (1.1) | 14.1 | (1.1) | -0.7 | (0.8) | 0.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Greece | -3.4 | (1.6) | 18.4 | (1.7) | -15.0 | c | -3.4 | (1.6) | 3.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Hungary | 5.5 | (1.1) | 2.7 | (1.1) | -8.1 | (0.9) | 5.5 | (1.1) | -5.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Ireland | -0.9 | (0.4) | -0.4 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (1.6) | -1.3 | (1.6) | 1.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Italy | 3.1 | (0.9) | -1.4 | (1.1) | -1.7 | (0.5) | 0.5 | (0.5) | -0.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Korea | 4.4 | (0.9) | -4.5 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.9) | -4.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | -4.0 | (0.3) | -5.1 | (0.3) | 9.1 | (0.2) | -10.6 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | -18.3 | (3.1) | 17.1 | (3.0) | 1.2 | (0.6) | -19.2 | (2.9) | 19.2 | (2.9) |
|  | Netherlands | -46.6 | (1.4) | -2.6 | (1.6) | 49.2 | (1.1) | -4.5 | (2.0) | 4.5 | (2.0) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.5 | (0.6) | -1.1 | (0.7) | 1.6 | (0.5) | -0.5 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Norway | -0.2 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.3) | -0.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | -0.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 0.8 | (0.6) | -0.8 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Portugal | 4.2 | (3.2) | -3.9 | (3.2) | -0.3 | (0.1) | 9.8 | (3.3) | -9.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 7.1 | (2.1) | -8.2 | (2.1) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 9.5 | (2.0) | -9.5 | (2.0) |
|  | Spain | 3.7 | (1.2) | -3.8 | (1.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Sweden | 1.3 | (0.4) | 1.1 | (1.2) | -2.4 | (1.1) | 2.3 | (1.1) | -2.3 | (1.1) |
|  | Switzerland | -4.2 | (1.3) | -2.2 | (2.3) | 6.3 | (2.7) | -6.1 | (3.0) | 6.1 | (3.0) |
|  | Turkey | 21.8 | (2.2) | 13.4 | (2.5) | -35.2 | (2.4) | -2.6 | (1.9) | 2.6 | (1.9) |
|  | United States | -20.4 | (1.9) | 10.6 | (1.7) | 9.8 | (1.2) | -20.4 | (1.9) | 20.4 | (1.9) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -3.1 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.2) | -1.2 | (0.3) | 1.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Brazil | -18.1 | (2.8) | -8.0 | (2.1) | 26.1 | (1.5) | -18.1 | (2.8) | 18.1 | (2.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -8.1 | (1.4) | 6.6 | (1.3) | 1.4 | (1.4) | -8.1 | (1.4) | 8.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 32.8 | (3.4) | -1.1 | (3.5) | -31.7 | (2.2) | -16.0 | (3.9) | 16.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Latvia | -0.9 | (1.1) | 4.1 | (1.2) | -3.2 | (0.7) | 2.3 | (0.9) | -2.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -1.9 | (1.7) | -5.0 | (1.6) | 6.9 | (0.3) | -6.1 | (0.3) | 6.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | -16.4 | (0.6) | -3.6 | (0.8) | 20.1 | (0.5) | -20.1 | (0.5) | 20.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | -23.0 | (2.2) | 6.5 | (2.7) | 16.4 | (1.8) | 50.8 | (2.8) | -50.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Thailand | -24.2 | (1.6) | 22.7 | (1.7) | 1.5 | (0.5) | -24.2 | (1.6) | 24.2 | (1.6) |
|  | Tunisia | -25.2 | (3.3) | 22.2 | (3.0) | 3.0 | (0.5) | -25.2 | (3.3) | 25.2 | (3.3) |
|  | Uruguay | 7.8 | (2.5) | -2.0 | (2.3) | -5.8 | (1.0) | 7.8 | (2.5) | -7.8 | (2.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[Part 1/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in ability grouping for mathematics classes
Table IV.2.21 Results based on school principals' reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink (ainst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441

Change between 2003 and 2012 in ability grouping for mathematics classes
Table IV.2.21 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In mathematics classes, teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 18.1 | (2.5) | 44.5 | (3.0) | 37.4 | (3.0) | 3.1 | (1.1) | 50.0 | (3.5) | 46.8 | (3.5) |
| U0 | Austria | 23.7 | (3.2) | 40.0 | (3.2) | 36.3 | (3.8) | 70.1 | (2.1) | 13.7 | (2.7) | 16.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Belgium | 50.2 | (3.2) | 31.3 | (3.1) | 18.5 | (2.1) | 29.2 | (2.9) | 51.5 | (3.2) | 19.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Canada | 37.0 | (2.2) | 38.8 | (2.1) | 24.2 | (2.1) | 2.6 | (0.5) | 48.8 | (1.9) | 48.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 53.4 | (3.5) | 30.7 | (3.0) | 15.8 | (2.4) | 58.9 | (3.2) | 27.1 | (2.9) | 14.1 | (2.5) |
|  | Denmark | 73.8 | (3.1) | 18.2 | (3.1) | 8.0 | (1.6) | 42.7 | (3.7) | 24.6 | (3.7) | 32.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Finland | 39.9 | (3.9) | 45.7 | (4.3) | 14.4 | (2.9) | 47.5 | (4.0) | 41.0 | (4.0) | 11.5 | (2.3) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | 35.2 | (3.6) | 17.0 | (2.4) | 47.8 | (3.6) | 53.6 | (3.0) | 20.0 | (2.9) | 26.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Greece | 62.0 | (4.7) | 12.6 | (3.9) | 25.4 | (4.1) | 77.9 | (3.7) | 15.9 | (3.9) | 6.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Hungary | 49.2 | (4.4) | 38.6 | (4.0) | 12.1 | (2.5) | 40.8 | (4.0) | 38.6 | (3.9) | 20.6 | (3.6) |
|  | Iceland | 47.9 | (0.2) | 39.2 | (0.2) | 12.9 | (0.1) | 20.0 | (0.2) | 22.7 | (0.2) | 57.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 27.1 | (4.2) | 42.7 | (4.6) | 30.3 | (4.1) | 3.2 | (1.5) | 34.4 | (4.4) | 62.5 | (4.4) |
|  | Italy | 39.1 | (3.3) | 37.3 | (3.6) | 23.7 | (2.8) | 32.8 | (2.9) | 42.6 | (3.4) | 24.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Japan | 19.6 | (3.5) | 18.7 | (3.3) | 61.7 | (3.9) | 54.6 | (4.2) | 31.8 | (3.6) | 13.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Korea | 14.9 | (2.7) | 69.4 | (4.0) | 15.7 | (3.1) | 26.1 | (3.6) | 63.1 | (4.3) | 10.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 46.2 | (0.1) | 34.0 | (0.1) | 19.7 | (0.0) | 38.8 | (0.1) | 38.3 | (0.1) | 22.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 32.1 | (3.4) | 41.5 | (3.3) | 26.4 | (3.2) | 18.0 | (2.5) | 60.9 | (3.5) | 21.1 | (2.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 29.7 | (4.1) | 39.1 | (4.4) | 31.2 | (4.0) | 8.4 | (2.5) | 30.9 | (4.0) | 60.7 | (4.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 23.5 | (2.9) | 57.5 | (3.5) | 19.0 | (2.9) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 55.6 | (3.5) | 43.7 | (3.6) |
|  | Norway | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Poland | 73.3 | (3.3) | 18.9 | (3.0) | 7.8 | (2.2) | 18.8 | (3.1) | 38.8 | (3.9) | 42.4 | (3.8) |
|  | Portugal | 67.5 | (4.2) | 16.9 | (3.0) | 15.6 | (3.1) | 28.2 | (4.3) | 38.8 | (4.3) | 33.0 | (4.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 53.3 | (3.5) | 22.5 | (3.2) | 24.3 | (2.8) | 25.6 | (3.3) | 25.4 | (2.7) | 48.9 | (3.7) |
|  | Spain | 51.0 | (3.6) | 32.7 | (3.1) | 16.3 | (2.9) | 5.4 | (2.0) | 57.2 | (3.8) | 37.4 | (3.7) |
|  | Sweden | 34.0 | (4.0) | 45.2 | (3.7) | 20.8 | (3.1) | 6.3 | (1.8) | 38.8 | (4.0) | 55.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 42.2 | (3.8) | 28.9 | (3.8) | 28.9 | (3.5) | 19.5 | (2.7) | 45.7 | (4.2) | 34.8 | (3.2) |
|  | Turkey | 12.4 | (3.0) | 27.5 | (4.2) | 60.1 | (5.1) | 20.3 | (3.3) | 40.2 | (5.0) | 39.5 | (4.7) |
|  | United States | 14.2 | (2.3) | 46.6 | (3.8) | 39.2 | (3.8) | 2.6 | (1.0) | 56.4 | (3.4) | 41.0 | (3.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 39.6 | (0.6) | 34.7 | (0.7) | 25.7 | (0.6) | 28.0 | (0.5) | 39.0 | (0.7) | 33.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Brazil | 30.4 | (3.2) | 16.5 | (3.0) | 53.1 | (3.7) | 21.6 | (2.8) | 26.5 | (3.1) | 51.9 | (3.3) |
| $\stackrel{\Xi}{\Xi}$ | Hong Kong-China | 34.5 | (3.9) | 47.1 | (4.5) | 18.4 | (3.1) | 13.1 | (3.1) | 66.4 | (4.2) | 20.5 | (3.5) |
|  | Indonesia | 76.3 | (3.3) | 10.0 | (2.3) | 13.8 | (2.7) | 26.3 | (3.1) | 17.5 | (2.8) | 56.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Latvia | 43.7 | (4.4) | 52.1 | (4.3) | 4.2 | (1.7) | 8.5 | (2.6) | 53.1 | (5.1) | 38.4 | (5.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 33.1 | (0.4) | 33.7 | (0.4) | 33.1 | (0.5) | 7.7 | (0.1) | 70.7 | (0.5) | 21.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Macao-China | 63.4 | (0.2) | 17.2 | (0.2) | 19.4 | (0.2) | 43.3 | (0.2) | 31.7 | (0.2) | 25.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 43.1 | (4.3) | 53.6 | (4.6) | 3.3 | (1.6) | 8.3 | (2.4) | 47.8 | (3.7) | 43.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Thailand | 35.5 | (3.6) | 48.6 | (3.8) | 16.0 | (2.7) | 19.1 | (3.2) | 36.5 | (4.0) | 44.4 | (4.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 63.6 | (4.3) | 7.9 | (2.4) | 28.5 | (3.8) | 44.3 | (4.1) | 10.6 | (2.2) | 45.2 | (4.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 44.3 | (3.6) | 44.2 | (3.6) | 11.5 | (2.4) | 24.2 | (4.1) | 59.3 | (4.7) | 16.5 | (2.6) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
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Table IV.2.21 Results based on school principals' reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink (ainst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In mathematics classes, teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 21.3 | (1.3) | 50.2 | (1.5) | 28.5 | (1.7) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 48.6 | (1.7) | 49.8 | (1.6) |
| un | Austria | 31.4 | (3.9) | 51.8 | (4.4) | 16.9 | (2.9) | 71.9 | (2.3) | 14.7 | (2.3) | 13.4 | (1.8) |
|  | Belgium | 55.8 | (3.3) | 27.7 | (2.8) | 16.4 | (2.2) | 20.6 | (2.9) | 57.0 | (3.1) | 22.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Canada | 35.4 | (2.8) | 47.7 | (2.7) | 16.9 | (2.0) | 7.1 | (1.2) | 49.2 | (2.5) | 43.8 | (2.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 49.8 | (3.7) | 37.4 | (3.6) | 12.8 | (2.0) | 58.8 | (4.2) | 30.6 | (3.7) | 10.6 | (2.7) |
|  | Denmark | 42.4 | (3.6) | 52.1 | (3.7) | 5.5 | (1.7) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 58.0 | (3.8) | 17.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Finland | 51.7 | (2.9) | 37.2 | (3.2) | 11.1 | (2.3) | 35.5 | (3.5) | 46.4 | (3.8) | 18.0 | (2.5) |
|  | France | 67.6 | (3.1) | 22.6 | (2.8) | 9.7 | (2.0) | 43.8 | (3.5) | 31.4 | (3.2) | 24.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Germany | 40.9 | (3.5) | 33.4 | (3.2) | 25.7 | (3.1) | 31.9 | (3.1) | 32.9 | (3.4) | 35.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Greece | 63.7 | (4.1) | 18.8 | (3.4) | 17.5 | (3.0) | 81.4 | (3.2) | 11.3 | (3.2) | 7.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Hungary | 55.9 | (4.0) | 33.8 | (3.7) | 10.3 | (2.4) | 23.3 | (2.9) | 31.2 | (3.8) | 45.5 | (3.8) |
|  | Iceland | 67.9 | (0.2) | 29.1 | (0.2) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 12.9 | (0.1) | 40.8 | (0.2) | 46.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 18.7 | (3.0) | 41.6 | (3.8) | 39.7 | (4.1) | 0.8 | (0.7) | 40.2 | (4.0) | 59.0 | (4.0) |
|  | Italy | 44.9 | (2.2) | 41.2 | (2.1) | 13.9 | (1.6) | 24.1 | (1.7) | 48.7 | (1.9) | 27.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Japan | 42.1 | (3.7) | 40.9 | (3.7) | 17.0 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (3.7) | 44.6 | (3.6) | 18.6 | (2.9) |
|  | Korea | 17.2 | (3.1) | 51.0 | (4.0) | 31.8 | (3.6) | 9.9 | (2.3) | 48.6 | (3.8) | 41.5 | (3.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 44.4 | (0.1) | 39.3 | (0.1) | 16.3 | (0.1) | 32.1 | (0.1) | 41.4 | (0.1) | 26.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 30.6 | (1.9) | 37.4 | (1.9) | 32.0 | (1.8) | 26.3 | (1.6) | 32.2 | (1.9) | 41.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 38.9 | (4.2) | 34.9 | (3.7) | 26.2 | (4.2) | 6.4 | (1.7) | 39.0 | (4.6) | 54.6 | (4.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 22.8 | (3.4) | 58.4 | (3.6) | 18.8 | (3.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 60.5 | (3.7) | 38.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Norway | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Poland | 63.2 | (4.4) | 13.1 | (2.9) | 23.7 | (3.7) | 42.4 | (4.1) | 19.3 | (3.5) | 38.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Portugal | 60.9 | (4.0) | 32.3 | (3.8) | 6.7 | (2.7) | 38.3 | (4.1) | 38.1 | (3.7) | 23.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 55.9 | (4.1) | 25.7 | (3.2) | 18.3 | (3.4) | 28.4 | (3.3) | 39.1 | (3.3) | 32.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Spain | 59.2 | (2.6) | 26.0 | (2.2) | 14.8 | (2.0) | 7.6 | (1.6) | 43.8 | (2.8) | 48.6 | (2.9) |
|  | Sweden | 55.9 | (4.0) | 33.8 | (3.3) | 10.3 | (2.3) | 15.7 | (2.8) | 27.8 | (3.3) | 56.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 36.7 | (3.2) | 30.6 | (3.2) | 32.7 | (2.8) | 15.0 | (2.3) | 40.9 | (3.4) | 44.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Turkey | 43.0 | (3.6) | 21.7 | (3.4) | 35.3 | (4.0) | 24.2 | (3.1) | 42.1 | (3.9) | 33.7 | (3.7) |
|  | United States | 33.6 | (4.2) | 56.0 | (4.4) | 10.4 | (2.9) | 6.1 | (2.6) | 62.9 | (4.2) | 31.0 | (3.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 43.9 | (0.6) | 37.2 | (0.6) | 19.0 | (0.5) | 25.4 | (0.5) | 40.4 | (0.6) | 34.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Brazil | 37.5 | (2.6) | 20.4 | (2.4) | 42.1 | (2.5) | 18.4 | (2.2) | 28.1 | (2.2) | 53.5 | (2.6) |
| $\stackrel{Ð}{y}$ | Hong Kong-China | 41.0 | (4.4) | 50.0 | (4.4) | 9.0 | (2.4) | 9.0 | (2.2) | 60.1 | (4.3) | 31.0 | (4.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 52.6 | (3.8) | 22.2 | (3.2) | 25.2 | (3.4) | 24.6 | (3.2) | 27.7 | (3.6) | 47.6 | (3.8) |
|  | Latvia | 41.7 | (3.7) | 53.0 | (3.8) | 5.2 | (1.8) | 17.8 | (3.0) | 46.1 | (3.9) | 36.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 43.3 | (0.6) | 32.1 | (0.9) | 24.5 | (0.6) | 40.1 | (0.7) | 13.2 | (1.2) | 46.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 49.2 | (0.1) | 29.4 | (0.0) | 21.4 | (0.0) | 33.9 | (0.0) | 52.9 | (0.0) | 13.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 35.4 | (3.9) | 60.5 | (3.9) | 4.1 | (1.3) | 4.0 | (1.2) | 39.2 | (3.1) | 56.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Thailand | 21.1 | (2.5) | 74.4 | (3.0) | 4.4 | (1.7) | 23.7 | (2.8) | 71.0 | (3.1) | 5.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 51.7 | (4.0) | 18.5 | (3.0) | 29.8 | (4.0) | 17.7 | (2.9) | 32.1 | (3.8) | 50.2 | (4.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 40.0 | (3.9) | 38.5 | (3.5) | 21.5 | (3.3) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 58.6 | (3.8) | 32.5 | (3.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
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|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mathematics classes study similar content, but at different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | Different classes study different content or sets of mathematics topics that have different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | Students are grouped by ability within their mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 5.4 | (3.6) | -0.6 | (3.5) | -4.8 | (2.2) | 3.5 | (3.2) | -0.3 | (3.6) | -3.2 | (2.9) | -5.9 | (3.5) | 11.1 | (3.4) | -5.1 | (2.6) |
|  | Austria | -2.9 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (3.5) | 1.9 | (3.1) | a | a | a | a | a | a | -0.4 | (2.4) | 9.5 | (4.7) | -9.1 | (4.7) |
|  | Belgium | 7.6 | (2.5) | 9.2 | (4.5) | -16.8 | (4.4) | -2.6 | (2.8) | 12.5 | (4.5) | -9.9 | (4.4) | 1.7 | (1.1) | 1.7 | (3.5) | -3.4 | (3.5) |
|  | Canada | -2.4 | (3.3) | 3.3 | (3.3) | -0.9 | (2.7) | -3.0 | (3.0) | -2.9 | (3.3) | 5.9 | (2.5) | 1.5 | (2.8) | 9.8 | (3.3) | -11.3 | (3.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.9 | (3.2) | 0.8 | (3.8) | -2.7 | (4.5) | -5.8 | (2.5) | -0.9 | (4.5) | 6.7 | (4.9) | -5.3 | (2.8) | 2.7 | (4.7) | 2.6 | (4.5) |
|  | Denmark | -10.1 | (4.3) | 29.3 | (5.5) | -19.2 | (5.5) | -8.2 | (3.3) | 31.1 | (4.9) | -22.9 | (4.8) | -0.4 | (2.4) | 19.1 | (4.8) | -18.7 | (4.6) |
|  | Finland | 3.6 | (3.3) | 7.1 | (5.0) | -10.7 | (5.0) | 5.1 | (1.7) | 12.7 | (4.9) | -17.8 | (5.0) | 0.4 | (2.6) | 4.7 | (4.9) | -5.2 | (5.3) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 8.5 | (4.1) | 10.6 | (4.4) | -19.2 | (4.6) | -1.1 | (3.4) | 10.0 | (4.2) | -8.8 | (4.6) | 8.4 | (3.3) | -3.0 | (5.0) | -5.3 | (4.9) |
|  | Greece | 0.4 | (3.5) | -1.6 | (4.7) | 1.2 | (4.6) | 0.6 | c | -3.3 | (2.3) | 2.6 | (2.4) | 0.8 | (1.0) | 0.5 | (1.5) | -1.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Hungary | 25.4 | (5.1) | -8.6 | (5.4) | -16.8 | (5.4) | 0.7 | (2.8) | 4.6 | (5.3) | -5.3 | (5.5) | -4.4 | (3.9) | -5.6 | (5.4) | 10.0 | (5.8) |
|  | Iceland | -31.3 | (0.3) | 15.4 | (0.3) | 15.9 | (0.3) | 15.0 | (0.3) | 8.9 | (0.3) | -23.9 | (0.2) | -5.0 | (0.2) | 17.7 | (0.3) | -12.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | -10.5 | (5.9) | 12.8 | (6.0) | -2.3 | (2.2) | -3.4 | (5.3) | 5.8 | (5.8) | -2.4 | (5.3) | 4.5 | (5.8) | 8.2 | (5.7) | -12.7 | (4.5) |
|  | Italy | 1.9 | (3.3) | 12.2 | (4.2) | -14.1 | (3.7) | -0.8 | (2.6) | 5.0 | (4.1) | -4.2 | (4.2) | -0.1 | (1.5) | 7.6 | (3.8) | -7.5 | (4.0) |
|  | Japan | 3.8 | (3.8) | 13.5 | (5.2) | -17.4 | (5.7) | -0.3 | (1.9) | 3.9 | (4.6) | -3.6 | (4.7) | 2.7 | (3.8) | 7.1 | (4.9) | -9.8 | (5.5) |
|  | Korea | 27.2 | (4.9) | -9.5 | (6.0) | -17.7 | (4.5) | 10.1 | (3.1) | -3.9 | (5.7) | -6.2 | (5.8) | 5.0 | (3.3) | -3.0 | (5.6) | -2.0 | (5.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 12.9 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.1) | -15.4 | (0.1) | -5.6 | (0.1) | -0.5 | (0.1) | 6.1 | (0.1) | 1.2 | c | 26.7 | (0.1) | -27.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 19.5 | (3.0) | -21.7 | (4.1) | 2.2 | (3.7) | 10.8 | (2.5) | -28.9 | (4.1) | 18.1 | (3.6) | 10.8 | (2.5) | 0.0 | (4.0) | -10.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.6 | (6.7) | 4.7 | (6.4) | -5.3 | (4.6) | -8.2 | (5.7) | 9.7 | (5.7) | -1.5 | (4.9) | -0.8 | (3.8) | 6.2 | (6.4) | -5.4 | (6.2) |
|  | New Zealand | -12.3 | (5.3) | 11.6 | (5.3) | 0.7 | (1.8) | 8.1 | (3.7) | -3.0 | (4.2) | -5.2 | (2.4) | 15.4 | (5.2) | -8.8 | (5.6) | -6.6 | (3.4) |
|  | Norway | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Poland | -3.8 | (5.8) | -22.0 | (5.1) | 25.7 | (5.3) | 1.2 | (1.4) | -3.7 | (4.6) | 2.5 | (4.8) | -0.3 | (2.1) | -3.8 | (4.4) | 4.1 | (4.7) |
|  | Portugal | -11.2 | (5.5) | -2.2 | (5.7) | 13.5 | (5.9) | 4.4 | (2.0) | 20.2 | (4.2) | -24.7 | (4.6) | -0.2 | (0.6) | 13.5 | (4.5) | -13.3 | (4.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -14.4 | (4.8) | 10.5 | (4.6) | 3.8 | (4.7) | -5.2 | (3.1) | 7.6 | (4.4) | -2.4 | (5.2) | -0.1 | (2.4) | -1.9 | (5.1) | 2.0 | (5.0) |
|  | Spain | 6.1 | (4.5) | -11.9 | (4.7) | 5.8 | (3.2) | 10.8 | (3.1) | -4.4 | (5.1) | -6.4 | (4.9) | -1.0 | (1.9) | -13.6 | (3.9) | 14.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Sweden | 2.5 | (5.0) | -11.7 | (5.2) | 9.3 | (3.6) | -1.8 | (3.5) | -10.7 | (5.4) | 12.6 | (5.2) | -13.0 | (3.9) | -8.7 | (4.8) | 21.8 | (5.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 15.2 | (3.6) | -7.7 | (5.4) | -7.4 | (5.0) | -5.3 | (4.0) | 11.6 | (5.1) | -6.3 | (4.8) | 5.3 | (3.7) | 6.1 | (4.4) | -11.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Turkey | -4.2 | (5.9) | 2.8 | (6.2) | 1.4 | (4.8) | -11.6 | (4.8) | -6.9 | (5.5) | 18.5 | (5.8) | -4.0 | (3.1) | -5.2 | (4.4) | 9.2 | (5.3) |
|  | United States | -4.2 | (4.7) | 1.0 | (5.8) | 3.2 | (4.0) | -12.8 | (4.2) | 10.2 | (5.2) | 2.6 | (4.2) | -9.0 | (4.3) | 20.4 | (5.6) | -11.4 | (5.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 1.3 | (0.8) | 1.9 | (0.9) | -3.2 | (0.8) | -0.2 | (0.6) | 3.3 | (0.9) | -3.0 | (0.9) | 0.3 | (0.6) | 4.4 | (0.9) | -4.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Brazil | 4.0 | (4.4) | 1.3 | (4.0) | -5.3 | (4.2) | -7.7 | (4.1) | -2.6 | (4.4) | 10.4 | (4.7) | -1.0 | (2.1) | 4.5 | (3.1) | -3.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 12.6 | (5.1) | -9.1 | (5.9) | -3.5 | (4.0) | 2.2 | (4.2) | 3.4 | (5.9) | -5.5 | (5.7) | 1.7 | (2.3) | 5.5 | (5.6) | -7.2 | (5.8) |
|  | Indonesia | -1.9 | (4.8) | 0.3 | (5.0) | 1.5 | (4.9) | -7.5 | (4.9) | 18.5 | (4.7) | -11.0 | (5.1) | 3.8 | (3.4) | 2.4 | (3.4) | -6.2 | (4.5) |
|  | Latvia | -2.5 | (5.9) | -2.8 | (6.3) | 5.3 | (4.5) | -3.5 | (4.0) | -5.1 | (6.3) | 8.6 | (5.9) | 1.1 | (2.7) | -11.8 | (4.7) | 10.6 | (4.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 17.4 | (1.3) | -16.1 | (1.3) | -1.3 | (0.8) | -0.7 | (0.8) | -51.0 | (1.4) | 51.7 | (1.2) | 25.0 | (0.9) | -21.3 | (1.0) | -3.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 3.5 | (0.0) | 14.7 | (0.2) | -18.3 | (0.3) | -6.3 | (0.2) | 17.9 | (0.2) | -11.7 | (0.2) | 1.1 | c | 24.0 | (0.2) | -25.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 15.0 | (5.0) | -9.6 | (5.3) | -5.4 | (3.0) | -10.2 | (3.9) | -19.2 | (4.6) | 29.4 | (5.1) | -3.1 | (2.9) | 7.9 | (5.1) | -4.8 | (4.6) |
|  | Thailand | -22.3 | (4.3) | 26.4 | (5.2) | -4.1 | (5.3) | -36.6 | c | 23.0 | (5.4) | 13.6 | (5.3) | -12.5 | (2.7) | 6.8 | (5.3) | 5.7 | (5.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 4.5 | (5.7) | 24.6 | (4.7) | -29.1 | (5.1) | 11.2 | (5.4) | 19.9 | (5.1) | -31.1 | (5.9) | -1.5 | (2.7) | -0.1 | (3.6) | 1.6 | (4.3) |
|  | Uruguay | 11.7 | (4.0) | 7.2 | (5.4) | -18.9 | (4.9) | 8.6 | (3.3) | 23.0 | (5.9) | -31.6 | (5.7) | 1.4 | c | -3.8 | (3.3) | 2.4 | (3.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 扇ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
[Part 6/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in ability grouping for mathematics classes
Table IV.2.21 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In mathematics classes. teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. S.E. |  | \% dif. S.E. |  | \% dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 3.2 | (2.9) | 5.6 | (3.3) | -8.9 | (3.4) | -1.5 | (1.2) | -1.4 | (3.9) | 3.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Austria | 7.6 | (5.0) | 11.8 | (5.4) | -19.4 | (4.8) | 1.9 | (3.1) | 1.0 | (3.5) | -2.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Belgium | 5.7 | (4.5) | -3.6 | (4.2) | -2.1 | (3.1) | -8.6 | (4.1) | 5.5 | (4.4) | 3.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Canada | -1.6 | (3.6) | 8.9 | (3.4) | -7.3 | (2.9) | 4.5 | (1.3) | 0.3 | (3.2) | -4.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Czech Republic | -3.6 | (5.1) | 6.7 | (4.7) | -3.1 | (3.2) | -0.1 | (5.2) | 3.5 | (4.7) | -3.4 | (3.7) |
|  | Denmark | -31.4 | (4.7) | 33.9 | (4.8) | -2.4 | (2.3) | -18.6 | (4.9) | 33.4 | (5.3) | -14.8 | (4.7) |
|  | Finland | 11.8 | (4.9) | -8.5 | (5.4) | -3.2 | (3.7) | -12.0 | (5.3) | 5.4 | (5.5) | 6.6 | (3.4) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 5.7 | (5.0) | 16.4 | (4.0) | -22.1 | (4.8) | -21.7 | (4.3) | 12.9 | (4.5) | 8.8 | (4.4) |
|  | Greece | 1.7 | (6.2) | 6.2 | (5.1) | -7.9 | (5.1) | 3.5 | (4.9) | -4.6 | (5.0) | 1.1 | (3.5) |
|  | Hungary | 6.7 | (6.0) | -4.9 | (5.5) | -1.8 | (3.5) | -17.5 | (4.9) | -7.4 | (5.5) | 24.9 | (5.2) |
|  | Iceland | 20.1 | (0.3) | -10.1 | (0.3) | -10.0 | (0.1) | -7.1 | (0.2) | 18.1 | (0.3) | -10.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | -8.4 | (5.1) | -1.0 | (6.0) | 9.4 | (5.8) | -2.4 | (1.6) | 5.9 | (5.9) | -3.5 | (5.9) |
|  | Italy | 5.9 | (4.0) | 3.9 | (4.2) | -9.8 | (3.3) | -8.7 | (3.3) | 6.1 | (3.9) | 2.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Japan | 22.5 | (5.1) | 22.2 | (4.9) | -44.7 | (4.7) | -17.8 | (5.6) | 12.7 | (5.1) | 5.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Korea | 2.3 | (4.1) | -18.4 | (5.6) | 16.1 | (4.8) | -16.2 | (4.3) | -14.5 | (5.8) | 30.7 | (4.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | -1.8 | (0.1) | 5.3 | (0.1) | -3.5 | (0.1) | -6.7 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | -1.4 | (3.9) | -4.1 | (3.8) | 5.6 | (3.7) | 8.3 | (3.0) | -28.7 | (3.9) | 20.4 | (3.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 9.2 | (5.9) | -4.2 | (5.7) | -4.9 | (5.8) | -2.0 | (3.0) | 8.1 | (6.1) | -6.1 | (6.5) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.7 | (4.5) | 0.9 | (5.0) | -0.1 | (4.2) | 0.7 | (1.1) | 4.9 | (5.1) | -5.5 | (5.0) |
|  | Norway | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Poland | -10.1 | (5.5) | -5.8 | (4.2) | 15.9 | (4.3) | 23.6 | (5.1) | -19.5 | (5.3) | -4.1 | (5.8) |
|  | Portugal | -6.5 | (5.8) | 15.5 | (4.8) | -8.9 | (4.1) | 10.1 | (6.0) | -0.7 | (5.7) | -9.4 | (5.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 2.7 | (5.4) | 3.3 | (4.5) | -5.9 | (4.5) | 2.8 | (4.7) | 13.7 | (4.3) | -16.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Spain | 8.2 | (4.5) | -6.8 | (3.8) | -1.5 | (3.5) | 2.2 | (2.5) | -13.4 | (4.7) | 11.2 | (4.7) |
|  | Sweden | 21.8 | (5.7) | -11.3 | (4.9) | -10.5 | (3.8) | 9.4 | (3.3) | -11.0 | (5.2) | 1.5 | (5.1) |
|  | Switzerland | -5.5 | (5.0) | 1.8 | (4.9) | 3.7 | (4.5) | -4.5 | (3.6) | -4.8 | (5.4) | 9.3 | (4.4) |
|  | Turkey | 30.6 | (4.7) | -5.8 | (5.4) | -24.8 | (6.5) | 3.9 | (4.5) | 1.9 | (6.4) | -5.8 | (6.0) |
|  | United States | 19.4 | (4.8) | 9.4 | (5.8) | -28.8 | (4.8) | 3.5 | (2.8) | 6.6 | (5.4) | -10.0 | (5.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 4.2 | (0.9) | 2.5 | (0.9) | -6.7 | (0.8) | -2.6 | (0.7) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| : | Brazil | 7.1 | (4.1) | 3.9 | (3.9) | -10.9 | (4.4) | -3.3 | (3.6) | 1.7 | (3.8) | 1.6 | (4.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.5 | (5.9) | 3.0 | (6.2) | -9.5 | (3.9) | -4.2 | (3.8) | -6.4 | (6.0) | 10.5 | (5.3) |
|  | Indonesia | -23.6 | (5.0) | 12.2 | (3.9) | 11.4 | (4.3) | -1.6 | (4.4) | 10.3 | (4.6) | -8.6 | (5.2) |
|  | Latvia | -2.0 | (5.8) | 0.9 | (5.7) | 1.0 | (2.4) | 9.3 | (3.9) | -7.0 | (6.4) | -2.3 | (6.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 10.2 | (0.7) | -1.6 | (1.0) | -8.6 | (0.8) | 32.4 | (0.7) | -57.6 | (1.3) | 25.1 | (1.3) |
|  | Macao-China | -14.1 | (0.2) | 12.2 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (0.2) | -9.4 | (0.2) | 21.1 | (0.2) | -11.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | -7.7 | (5.8) | 6.9 | (6.0) | 0.8 | (2.1) | -4.3 | (2.7) | -8.7 | (4.9) | 12.9 | (4.6) |
|  | Thailand | -14.3 | (4.4) | 25.9 | (4.9) | -11.5 | (3.1) | 4.5 | (4.3) | 34.4 | (5.1) | -39.0 | (4.7) |
|  | Tunisia | -11.9 | (5.8) | 10.6 | (3.9) | 1.3 | (5.5) | -26.5 | (5.1) | 21.6 | (4.4) | 5.0 | (5.8) |
|  | Uruguay | -4.3 | (5.3) | -5.7 | (5.0) | 10.0 | (4.1) | -15.3 | (4.7) | -0.6 | (6.0) | 16.0 | (4.4) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
StatLink 句ilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
[Part 1/1]
Cumulative expenditure by educational institutions
Table IV.3.1 In equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, based on full-time equivalents


1. Public institutions only. For Ireland and Portugal, this applies only to the PISA 2012 columns
2. Only for students aged 7 to 15.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2004: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2004a). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2004: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2004a) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/educationataglance2004-home.htm. Values reported in Education at a Glance 2004: OECD Indicators (2004a) have been updated with the GDP deflator to allow for comparisons with data from 2010
b. Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2013a). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2013a) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag.htm
c. PISA system-level data collection in 2013
d. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (World Education Indicators Programme).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 1/1]
Per capita GDP
Table IV.3.2 In equivalent USD converted using PPPs


1. The GDP mainland market value is used for Norway.

Sources: a. OECD National Accounts Database, 2013.
b. Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2013a). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2013a) Annex 3,
available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag.htm.
c. PISA system-level data collection in 2013
d. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (World Education Indicators Programme).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

［Part 1／1］
Teachers＇salaries
Annual statutory teachers＇salaries in public institutions at starting salary，after 10 and 15 years of experience and Table IV．3．3 at the top of the scale，by level of education（2011）

|  |  |  | Ratio of salaries after 15 years of experience／minimum training to per capita GDP |  | Ratio of salary at top of scale to starting salary |  | Years from starting to top salary（lower secondary education） | Outstanding performance in teaching used as a criteria for the base salary and additional payments in public institutions． |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education |  | Decisions on position in base salary scale | Decisions on supplemental payments which are paid every year | Decisions on supplemental incidental payments |
|  |  |  | （1） | （2） | （3） | （4） | （5） | （6） | （7） | （8） |
| 0 | Australia | a | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.41 | 1.41 | 9 | No | No | No |
| U | Austria | a | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.96 | 2.02 | 34 | No | No | Yes |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium（FI．） | a | 1.24 | 1.59 | 1.73 | 1.76 | 27 | No | No | No |
|  | Belgium（Fr．） | a | 1.21 | 1.55 | 1.72 | 1.75 | 27 | No | No | No |
|  | Canada | a | 1.50 | 1.51 | 1.59 | 1.59 | 11 | No | No | No |
|  | Chile | a | 1.31 | 1.39 | 1.79 | 1.83 | 30 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Czech Republic | a | 0.87 | 0.93 | 1.36 | 1.40 | 27 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Denmark | a | 1.36 | 1.58 | 1.16 | 1.31 | 8 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | England | a | 1.32 | 1.32 | 1.46 | 1.46 | 12 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Estonia | a | 0.68 | 0.68 | 1.46 | 1.46 | 7 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Finland | a | 1.21 | 1.28 | 1.31 | 1.35 | 20 | No | Yes | No |
|  | France | a | 1.07 | 1.08 | 1.82 | 1.81 | 34 | No | No | No |
|  | Germany | a | 1.75 | 1.89 | 1.33 | 1.38 | 28 | No | No | No |
|  | Greece | a | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.49 | 1.49 | 33 | No | No | No |
|  | Hungary | a | 0.70 | 0.83 | 1.64 | 1.90 | 40 | No | Yes | No |
|  | Iceland | a | 0.80 | 0.81 | 1.17 | 1.26 | 18 | No | No | No |
|  | Ireland | a | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 22 | No | No | No |
|  | Israel | a | 1.02 | 0.87 | 1.88 | 2.24 | 36 | No | No | No |
|  | Italy | a | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.50 | 1.57 | 35 | No | No | No |
|  | Japan | a | 1.47 | 1.47 | 2.21 | 2.27 | 34 | No | No | No |
|  | Korea | a | 1.82 | 1.82 | 2.78 | 2.78 | 37 | No | No | No |
|  | Luxembourg | a | 1.24 | 1.24 | 1.74 | 1.74 | 30 | No | No | No |
|  | Mexico | a | 1.78 | m | 2.12 | m | 14 | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Netherlands | a | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.70 | 1.70 | 15 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | New Zealand | a | 1.50 | 1.52 | 1.50 | 1.51 | 8 | No | Yes | No |
|  | Norway ${ }^{1}$ | a | 0.89 | 0.96 | 1.26 | 1.21 | 16 | No | Yes | No |
|  | Poland | a | 0.98 | 1.12 | 1.68 | 1.70 | 20 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Portugal | a | 1.74 | 1.74 | 1.69 | 1.69 | 34 | No | No | No |
|  | Scotland | a | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 6 | No | No | No |
|  | Slovak Republic | a | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 32 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Slovenia | a | 1.29 | 1.29 | 1.28 | 1.28 | 13 | No | No | Yes |
|  | Spain | a | 1.58 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 38 | No | No | No |
|  | Sweden | a | 0.92 | 0.97 | 1.31 | 1.34 | a | Yes | No | No |
|  | Switzerland | a | m | m | 1.55 | 1.53 | 27 | No | No | No |
|  | Turkey | a | a | 1.87 | a | 1.15 | a | Yes | No | Yes |
|  | United States | a | 0.97 | 1.04 | 1.50 | 1.48 | m | No | No | Yes |
|  | OECD average |  | 1.24 | 1.29 | 1.61 | 1.62 | 24 |  |  |  |
|  | Albania | a | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| ® | Argentina | c | 0.79 | 0.79 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 25 | m | m | m |
| \％ | Brazil | $b$ | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| 2 | Bulgaria | $b$ | 0.95 | 0.95 | 2.22 | 2.22 | 20 | Yes | No | No |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 1.60 | 1.69 | 1.55 | 1.81 | 13 | No | Yes | No |
|  | Costa Rica |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 1.28 | 1.28 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 35 | No | Yes | No |
|  | Cyprus＊ | $b$ | 2.19 | 2.19 | 2.19 | 2.19 | 22 | No | No | No |
|  | Hong Kong－China | $b$ | 1.48 | 2.23 | 1.62 | 1.91 | 10 | No | No | No |
|  | Indonesia | a | 0.44 | 0.49 | 1.45 | 1.41 | 32 | No | No | No |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | 2.15 | 2.15 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 40 | No | No | No |
|  | Kazakhstan |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 0.52 | 0.52 | a | a | 15 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | m | m | 1.62 | 1.62 | a | Yes | No | No |
|  | Lithuania ${ }^{2}$ | $b$ | 1.01 | 1.01 | m | m | a | No | No | No |
|  | Macao－China | $b$ | 1.13 | 1.13 | 1.74 | 1.74 | 33 | No | No | No |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2.09 | 2.09 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 20 | No | No | No |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 1.55 | 1.55 | 1.12 | 1.13 | 40 | No | No | m |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 0.92 | 0.92 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 20 | No | No | No |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | 1.41 | 1.41 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 20 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Romania | $b$ | 0.44 | 0.44 | 2.54 | 2.54 | 40 | No | No | No |
|  | Russian Federation | a | m | m | m | m | m | No | No | Yes |
|  | Serbia |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai－China | $b$ | 0.94 | 1.15 | 4.51 | 5.58 | 35 | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 1.33 | 1.33 | 2.69 | 2.69 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | m | m | 1.64 | 1.64 | 20 | No | No | No |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 1.24 | 1.24 | 2.12 | 2.12 | 14 | No | No | No |
|  | Tunisia | c | 1.88 | 1.88 | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | m | m | 1.76 | 1.76 | 5 | No | No | No |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 0.76 | 0.79 | 1.66 | 1.64 | 32 | No | No | No |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | m | m | 2.13 | 2.13 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |

1．The GDP mainland market value is used for columns 1 and 2.
2．Average actual teachers＇salaries for all teachers，irrespective of the level of education they teach．
Sources：a．Education at a Glance 2013：OECD Indicators（OECD，2013a）．For further notes，see Education at a Glance 2013：OECD Indicators（OECD，2013a）Annex 3， available on line：www．oecd．org／edu／eag．htm
b．PISA system－level data collection in 2013
c．UNESCO Institute for Statistics（World Education Indicators Programme）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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|  |  | U |  | Competitive examination required to enter pre-service teacher training |  |  |  | Duration of teacher-training programme in years |  |  |  | Teaching practicum required as part of pre-service training |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Preprimary education | Primary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education | Preprimary education | Primary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education | Preprimary education | Primary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education |
|  |  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
|  | Australia | a | 2010 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | 4 | 4 | 4 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| U | Austria ${ }^{2}$ | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | a | No | 3 | 3 | 5.5 | 5.5 | Yes | Yes | a | No |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium (Fl.) | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Belgium (Fr.) | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Canada | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | 5 | 5 | 5 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Chile | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | m | m | m | m | No | No | No |
|  | Czech Republic | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Denmark | a | 2010 | Yes | No | No | No | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | England | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | No | No | No | No |
|  | Estonia | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Finland | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | France | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5,6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Germany | a | 2010 | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 5.5 | 5.5, 6.5 | 6.5 | a | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Greece | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4, 5 | Yes | Yes | a | a |
|  | Hungary | a | 2010 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | 4 | 4 | 5 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Iceland | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | 3,4 | 3,4 | 4 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Ireland | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 3,5.5 | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Israel ${ }^{3}$ | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3, 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Italy | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | 4 | 4-6 | 4-6 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Japan ${ }^{4}$ | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2, 4, 6 | 2, 4, 6 | 2, 4, 6 | 4,6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Korea | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2, 4, 6.5 | 4 | 4,6.5 | 4,6.5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Luxembourg | a | 2010 | Yes | No | No | No | 4 | 3,4 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Mexico | a | 2010 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | 4 | 4, 6 | 4, 6 | m | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Netherlands ${ }^{5}$ | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5,6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | New Zealand | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Norway | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 4 | 4, 6 | 4, 6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Poland | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3, 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Portugal | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Scotland | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | 4, 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Slovak Republic | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | 5 | 5 | 5 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Slovenia | a | 2010 | m | m | m | m | m | 5 | 5-6 | 5-6 | m | m | m | m |
|  | Spain | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Sweden | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Switzerland | a | 2010 | m | No | No | No | m | 3 | 5 | 6 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Turkey | a | 2010 | Yes | Yes | a | Yes | 4-5 | 4-5 | a | 4-5 | Yes | Yes | a | Yes |
|  | United States | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2-4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Albania | $b$ | 2010 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | Argentina | a | 2010 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| ส | Brazil | a | 2010 | No | No | No | No | m | m | m | m | No | No | No | No |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Cyprus* | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  | Hong Kong-China | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2010 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | 4-5 | 4-5 | 4-5 | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | No | No | No | No |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Macao-China | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Romania | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2010 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Serbia |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2010 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | m | m | m | m | m | m | No | No | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | m | m | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 2010 | No | No | No | No | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

1. Tertiary-type A programmes are largely theory-based and are designed to provide qualifications for entry into advanced research programmes and professions with high knowledge and skill requirements. Tertiary-type B programmes are classified at the same level of competence as tertiary-type A programmes but are more occupationally oriented and usually lead directly to the labour market.
2. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17.
3. Year of reference 2012 for column 7.
4. Year of reference 2007 for columns 17, 18, 19 and 20.
5. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools for 4-5 year-olds only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17.
6. Refers to full-time teachers only.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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|  |  | ISCED type of final qualification ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Percentage of current teacher stock with this type of qualification |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-primary education | Primary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education | Pre-primary education | Primary education | Lower secondary education | Upper secondary education |
|  |  | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 87\% | 91\% | $\mathrm{x}(19)$ |
| U | Austria ${ }^{2}$ | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 94\% | 94\% | 95\% | 78\% |
|  | Belgium (FI.) | 5B | 5B | 5B | 5A, 5B | 99\% | 98\% | 97\% | 96\% |
|  | Belgium (Fr.) | 5B | 5B | 5B | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | m | m |
|  | Canada | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Chile | m | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | m | m | m | m |
|  | Czech Republic | 5B, 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 12\% | 87\% | 88\% | 87\% |
|  | Denmark | 5B | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | England | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Estonia | 4, 5A, 5B | 5A | 5A | 5A | 70\% | 66\% | 75\% | 84\% |
|  | Finland | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 90\% | 90\% | 95\% |
|  | France | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 5B | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Greece | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 97\% | 94\% | 97\% | 98\% |
|  | Hungary | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 95\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Iceland | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 92\% | $\mathrm{x}(18)$ | 82\% |
|  | Ireland | $3,4,5 \mathrm{~A}, 5 \mathrm{~B}$ | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | m | m | m | m |
|  | Israel ${ }^{3}$ | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 74\% | 83\% | 92\% | 87\% |
|  | Italy | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 86\% | 90\% | 99\% |
|  | Japan ${ }^{4}$ | $5 \mathrm{~A}+5 \mathrm{~B}, 5 \mathrm{~A}, 5 \mathrm{~A}$ | 5A+5B, 5A, 5A | $5 \mathrm{~A}+5 \mathrm{~B}, 5 \mathrm{~A}, 5 \mathrm{~A}$ | 5A | 74\%, 21\%, 0.4\% | 15\%, 80\%, 3\% | 5\%, 89\%, 5\% | 75\%, 24\% |
|  | Korea | 5B,5A,5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Luxembourg | 5B | 5B | 5A | 5A | 86\% | 95.6\%, 4.5\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Mexico | m | 5A | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | m | 96\% | 90\% | 91\% |
|  | Netherlands ${ }^{5}$ | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | New Zealand | 5B, 5A | 5B, 5A | 5B, 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Norway | 5A | 5A | 5A, 5A | 5A, 5A | 83\% | 47\% | 46.8\%, m | 20.5\%, m |
|  | Poland | 5B, 5A | 5B, 5A | 5A | 5A | 0.9\%, 91.5\% | 0.8\%, 98\% | 99\% | 98\% |
|  | Portugal | 5 A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Scotland | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Slovak Republic | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | 93\%, 7\% | 91\%, 9\% | 87\%, 13\% |
|  | Slovenia | m | 5A | 5A | 5A, 5B | m | m | m | m |
|  | Spain | 5B, 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Sweden | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | $54 \%{ }^{6}$ | 82\% | $\mathrm{x}(18)$ | 72\% |
|  | Switzerland | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Turkey | 5A | 5A | a | 5A | 94\% | 91\% | a | 98\% |
|  | United States | 5B, 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 99\% | 99\% | 99\% | 99\% |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| 込 | Brazil | 3B, 5A | 3B | 5A | 5A | 87\% | 99\% | 84\% | 91\% |
|  | Bulgaria | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Colombia | 4 | 4 | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 6\% | 49\% | 32\% | 13\% |
|  | Costa Rica | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Cyprus* | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 5B | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | Indonesia | m | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Jordan | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 85\% | 90\% | 96\% | 98\% |
|  | Kazakhstan | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 88\% | 88\% | 96\% | 96\% |
|  | Liechtenstein | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 30\% | 100\% | 100\% | 95\% |
|  | Lithuania | 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Macao-China | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | m | m | m | m |
|  | Malaysia | 4 | 5A | 5B | 5A, 5B | 2\% | 53\% | 24\% | 21\% |
|  | Montenegro | 5B | 5B | 5B | 5B | m | 64\% | 66\% | 92\% |
|  | Peru | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | m | m | m | m |
|  | Qatar | 4 | 5A | 5B | 5B | 40\% | 35\% | 65\% | 80\% |
|  | Romania | 4 | 4 | 5A, 5B | 5A, 5B | 95\% | 98\% | 95\% | 95\% |
|  | Russian Federation | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Serbia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | 5B | 5B | 5A | 5A | 94\% | 92\% | 93\% | 99\% |
|  | Singapore | 5B | 5A | 5A | 5A | 85\% | 62\% | 93\% | $\mathrm{x}(19)$ |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 80\% | 85\% | 90\% | 100\% |
|  | Thailand | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | a | a | a | a |
|  | Tunisia | 5A | 5A | m | m | 50\% | 50\% | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  | Uruguay | 5B | 5B | 5B | 5B | 100\% | 100\% | 59\% | 59\% |
|  | Viet Nam | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5A | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

1. Tertiary-type A programmes are largely theory-based and are designed to provide qualifications for entry into advanced research programmes and professions with high knowledge and skill requirements. Tertiary-type B programmes are classified at the same level of competence as tertiary-type A programmes but are more occupationally oriented and usually lead directly to the labour market.
2. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17
3. Year of reference 2012 for column 7.
4. Year of reference 2007 for columns 17, 18, 19 and 20.
5. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools for 4-5 year-olds only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17
6. Refers to full-time teachers only

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012
. PISA system-level data collection in 2013

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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1. The data of Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) have been updated in columns 2 to 4.
2. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25.
3. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools for $4-5$ year-olds only, for columns $1,5,9,13,17,21$ and 25.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012. b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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|  |  | Teaching practicum required to obtain credential/licence |  |  |  | Teaching practicum required after being recruited, as an induction/ probation period |  |  |  | Existence of a register for teachers |  |  |  | Compulsory requirement for continuing education to maintain employment in the teaching profession |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 京: |  |  |  | 京: |  |  |  | 르ㄷㅡㅡ들 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 륻. 듣 } \\ & \text { 든 } \\ & \text { 릉 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) | (21) | (22) | (23) | (24) | (25) | (26) | (27) | (28) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia ${ }^{1}$ | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | m | m | m |
| U | Austria ${ }^{2}$ | No | No | No | No | No | No | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium (Fl.) | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Belgium (Fr.) | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Canada | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | No | No | No |
|  | Chile | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No |
|  | Czech Republic | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Denmark | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | England | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Estonia | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Finland | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | France | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  | Germany | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | a | No | No | No | a | No | No | No | a | No | No | No |
|  | Greece | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hungary | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Iceland | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Ireland | m | m | m | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Israel | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Italy | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No |
|  | Japan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Korea | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Luxembourg | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Mexico | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No |
|  | Netherlands ${ }^{3}$ | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | New Zealand | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | m | m | m |
|  | Norway | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Poland | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Portugal | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Scotland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Slovak Republic | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No |
|  | Slovenia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Spain | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Sweden | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Switzerland | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No |
|  | Turkey | No | No | a | No | Yes | Yes | a | Yes | No | No | a | No | No | No | a | No |
|  | United States | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{5}$ | Argentina | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| \% | Brazil | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Bulgaria | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Colombia | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Costa Rica | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Cyprus* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Hong Kong-China | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Indonesia | m | No | No | No | m | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | No | No | No |
|  | Jordan | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Kazakhstan | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Liechtenstein | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Lithuania | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Macao-China | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Malaysia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Montenegro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Peru | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Qatar | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Romania | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | a | a | a | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Russian Federation | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Serbia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Singapore | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Chinese Taipei | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Thailand | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Tunisia | No | No | m | m | Yes | Yes | m | m | Yes | Yes | m | m | Yes | Yes | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Uruguay | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Viet Nam | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | a | a | a | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

1. The data of Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) have been updated in columns 2 to 4
2. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools only, for columns $1,5,9,13,17,21$ and 25.
3. Refers to pre-primary education provided in primary schools for $4-5$ year-olds only, for columns 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25 .

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012) Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

［Part 1／1］
Composition and qualifications of teaching staff
Table IV．3．6 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | School principals＇report on the following： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentageof certified teachers in the school |  | Percentage of teachers with ISCED 5A in the school |  | Percentage of mathematics teachers in the school |  | Percentage of mathematics teachers with ISCED 5A in the school |  |
|  |  | Mean \％ | S．E． | Mean \％ | S．E． | Mean \％ | S．E． | Mean \％ | S．E． |
|  | Australia | 97.8 | （0．5） | 97.0 | （0．7） | 17.1 | （0．3） | 62.8 | （1．1） |
| 0 | Austria | 87.0 | （1．8） | 52.6 | （1．8） | 20.6 | （1．2） | 46.3 | （4．2） |
|  | Belgium | 87.0 | （1．7） | 39.1 | （1．0） | 11.9 | （0．2） | 23.2 | （1．1） |
|  | Canada | 96.7 | （0．8） | 95.3 | （0．7） | 15.2 | （0．3） | 63.5 | （1．6） |
|  | Chile | 19.5 | （2．5） | 92.2 | （1．4） | 10.7 | （0．3） | 55.3 | （2．8） |
|  | Czech Republic | 91.6 | （0．7） | 91.8 | （0．7） | 16.5 | （0．9） | 81.5 | （2．2） |
|  | Denmark | m | m | 88.6 | （1．8） | 35.8 | （0．9） | 72.0 | （2．6） |
|  | Estonia | 94.9 | （0．4） | m | m | 9.1 | （0．3） | 73.6 | （2．4） |
|  | Finland | 91.5 | （0．9） | 91.5 | （0．9） | 14.4 | （0．3） | 63.5 | （2．0） |
|  | France | 81.4 | （1．6） | 65.7 | （3．1） | 11.3 | （0．2） | 83.0 | （2．7） |
|  | Germany | 93.4 | （1．3） | m | m | 27.6 | （0．8） | 60.0 | （2．6） |
|  | Greece | 81.8 | （3．1） | 93.5 | （1．3） | 13.9 | （0．2） | 98.3 | （1．1） |
|  | Hungary | m | m | 99.3 | （0．2） | 12.5 | （0．5） | 83.2 | （3．2） |
|  | Iceland | 97.6 | （0．0） | 81.8 | （0．2） | 38.1 | （0．1） | 6.5 | （0．1） |
|  | Ireland | 99.6 | （0．1） | 99.7 | （0．2） | 19.7 | （0．5） | 67.4 | （2．5） |
|  | Israel | 75.2 | （2．9） | 85.9 | （1．8） | 13.5 | （0．3） | 61.6 | （2．6） |
|  | Italy | 85.5 | （0．9） | 89.6 | （0．8） | 11.9 | （0．2） | 68.8 | （1．1） |
|  | Japan | 99.9 | （0．1） | 99.9 | （0．0） | 13.0 | （0．3） | m | m |
|  | Korea | 99.6 | （0．2） | 99.7 | （0．1） | 13.8 | （0．6） | 72.2 | （2．3） |
|  | Luxembourg | 69.4 | （0．0） | 91.6 | （0．0） | 10.1 | （0．0） | 76.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Mexico | 27.7 | （1．9） | 88.1 | （1．0） | 23.1 | （0．8） | 27.6 | （1．7） |
|  | Netherlands | 79.7 | （2．8） | 32.0 | （1．7） | 11.1 | （0．3） | 16.9 | （1．6） |
|  | New Zealand | 95.5 | （0．6） | 93.1 | （1．1） | 14.0 | （0．4） | 59.0 | （2．2） |
|  | Norway | 89.2 | （1．8） | 100.0 | c | 32.4 | （0．9） | 55.2 | （2．0） |
|  | Poland | 99.3 | （0．4） | 93.2 | （1．8） | 10.6 | （0．2） | 86.6 | （2．3） |
|  | Portugal | 95.8 | （0．8） | 71.5 | （4．1） | 11.8 | （0．3） | 74.8 | （2．8） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 94.6 | （1．1） | 90.4 | （1．2） | 16.1 | （0．8） | 43.4 | （3．4） |
|  | Slovenia | 95.3 | （0．1） | 88.3 | （0．2） | 9.6 | （0．1） | 71.3 | （0．6） |
|  | Spain | 100.0 | c | 94.6 | （1．2） | 14.6 | （0．6） | 46.9 | （1．5） |
|  | Sweden | 88.8 | （1．3） | 76.5 | （3．3） | 25.7 | （0．8） | 60.7 | （2．1） |
|  | Switzerland | 85.4 | （1．7） | 64.8 | （2．8） | 26.2 | （0．9） | 35.9 | （2．4） |
|  | Turkey | 92.1 | （1．3） | 93.3 | （1．5） | 12.1 | （0．3） | 13.4 | （2．9） |
|  | United Kingdom | 95.2 | （1．1） | 95.8 | （1．2） | 11.8 | （0．2） | 71.7 | （1．9） |
|  | United States | 95.5 | （0．8） | 98.7 | （0．2） | 14.6 | （0．7） | 65.8 | （3．4） |
|  | OECD average | 87.0 | （0．3） | 85.5 | （0．3） | 16.8 | （0．1） | 59.0 | （0．4） |
|  | Albania | 93.9 | （2．2） | 83.9 | （1．5） | 11.6 | （0．3） | 15.4 | （2．3） |
| $\stackrel{\text { E }}{ }$ | Argentina | 88.3 | （2．2） | 17.5 | （1．5） | 9.5 | （0．4） | 9.9 | （1．9） |
| こ | Brazil | m | m | 87.1 | （1．0） | 16.3 | （0．6） | 72.8 | （1．9） |
|  | Bulgaria | m | m | m | m | 9.9 | （0．9） | 86.0 | （2．3） |
|  | Colombia | 10.0 | （1．2） | 90.8 | （1．3） | 13.3 | （0．6） | 19.8 | （2．6） |
|  | Costa Rica | 78.7 | （2．0） | 84.0 | （2．2） | 10.3 | （0．4） | 71.2 | （3．7） |
|  | Croatia | 100.0 | c | 94.2 | （0．6） | 8.1 | （0．2） | 81.2 | （3．1） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 96.7 | （0．0） | 95.7 | （0．0） | 9.9 | （0．0） | 92.9 | （0．1） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 96.0 | （0．7） | 97.4 | （0．6） | 16.4 | （0．3） | 56.1 | （1．7） |
|  | Indonesia | 60.2 | （2．6） | 82.1 | （1．6） | 10.4 | （0．3） | 76.6 | （2．7） |
|  | Jordan | 73.7 | （3．2） | 84.8 | （1．8） | 10.8 | （0．2） | 89.5 | （1．6） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 91.2 | （2．1） | 85.3 | （2．1） | 9.2 | （1．0） | 87.9 | （2．3） |
|  | Latvia | 80.2 | （2．4） | 49.7 | （2．4） | 9.6 | （0．2） | 40.4 | （3．6） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 80.8 | （0．7） | 76.5 | （0．6） | 24.9 | （0．3） | 42.7 | （0．6） |
|  | Lithuania | 96.3 | （0．6） | 89.9 | （1．7） | 10.2 | （0．7） | 78.8 | （2．9） |
|  | Macao－China | 99.6 | （0．0） | 92.1 | （0．0） | 17.8 | （0．0） | 60.3 | （0．0） |
|  | Malaysia | 97.6 | （1．0） | 88.8 | （1．6） | 14.0 | （0．3） | 23.5 | （2．2） |
|  | Montenegro | 96.1 | （0．0） | 89.0 | （0．1） | 8.6 | （0．0） | 66.6 | （0．3） |
|  | Peru | 89.1 | （1．9） | 77.3 | （3．3） | 17.5 | （0．6） | 25.3 | （3．1） |
|  | Qatar | 75.1 | （0．1） | 97.0 | （0．0） | 16.1 | （0．0） | 39.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Romania | 99.4 | （0．2） | 95.9 | （0．7） | 9.3 | （0．2） | 92.8 | （1．4） |
|  | Russian Federation | 97.3 | （0．5） | 87.9 | （1．2） | 10.1 | （0．2） | 88.0 | （2．0） |
|  | Serbia | 91.1 | （1．9） | 6.8 | （1．7） | 8.2 | （0．2） | 83.1 | （3．4） |
|  | Shanghai－China | 96.7 | （0．5） | 95.1 | （0．5） | 15.1 | （0．2） | 85.0 | （1．3） |
|  | Singapore | 96.9 | （0．0） | 95.1 | （0．0） | 18.2 | （0．0） | 67.7 | （0．2） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 92.9 | （0．8） | 90.6 | （2．2） | 12.2 | （0．2） | 75.4 | （2．2） |
|  | Thailand | 93.7 | （0．7） | 99.2 | （0．2） | 11.3 | （0．3） | 79.0 | （2．1） |
|  | Tunisia | 56.9 | （3．9） | 87.3 | （1．7） | 11.3 | （0．6） | 87.7 | （1．9） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | m | m | 91.2 | （0．8） | 14.1 | （0．4） | 85.5 | （1．0） |
|  | Uruguay | 57.0 | （1．3） | 8.3 | （0．6） | 10.3 | （0．4） | 1.5 | （0．5） |
|  | Viet Nam | 78.5 | （3．4） | 87.2 | （2．6） | 16.1 | （0．3） | 62.4 | （3．8） |

＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink 唡列四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957460
[Part 1/1]
Student-teacher ratio
Table IV.3.8 Results based on school principals' reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
StatLink 满ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 1/4]
Student-teacher ratio, by school features
Table IV.3.9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | School principals' report on the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Student-teacher ratio in the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 13.1 | (0.1) | 13.4 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (0.1) | 12.9 | (0.1) | 12.7 | (0.2) | 13.7 | (0.1) | 12.4 | (0.2) |
| - | Austria | 11.5 | (0.7) | 11.5 | (0.6) | 10.6 | (0.5) | 10.4 | (0.3) | 12.7 | (1.3) | 10.4 | (0.5) | 10.0 | (0.4) |
| - | Belgium | 8.0 | (0.2) | 9.0 | (0.2) | 9.7 | (0.2) | 10.5 | (0.2) | 6.9 | (0.2) | 9.1 | (0.3) | 11.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 15.0 | (0.2) | 15.7 | (0.2) | 15.8 | (0.2) | 16.1 | (0.3) | 14.7 | (0.4) | 15.3 | (0.3) | 16.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Chile | 21.1 | (0.6) | 23.1 | (0.7) | 23.5 | (0.6) | 20.6 | (0.6) | 21.4 | (0.7) | 23.2 | (1.5) | 22.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | 12.8 | (0.4) | 13.3 | (0.4) | 13.2 | (0.3) | 13.2 | (0.3) | 12.4 | (0.8) | 13.6 | (0.4) | 12.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Denmark | 11.6 | (0.3) | 12.0 | (0.3) | 12.3 | (0.3) | 12.5 | (0.3) | 11.0 | (0.6) | 12.0 | (0.3) | 13.4 | (0.5) |
|  | Estonia | 10.4 | (0.2) | 11.1 | (0.2) | 11.8 | (0.2) | 12.2 | (0.1) | 9.7 | (0.4) | 11.2 | (0.2) | 13.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Finland | 10.2 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 10.7 | (0.1) | 10.9 | (0.1) | 9.2 | (0.3) | 10.8 | (0.2) | 11.4 | (0.2) |
|  | France | 11.8 | (0.2) | 11.9 | (0.2) | 11.7 | (0.2) | 11.9 | (0.3) | 12.3 | (0.4) | 11.3 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Germany | 14.3 | (0.3) | 15.1 | (0.4) | 15.4 | (0.4) | 15.6 | (0.5) | 13.5 | (0.5) | 15.7 | (0.3) | 16.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 8.5 | (0.3) | 9.1 | (0.4) | 9.5 | (0.3) | 9.4 | (0.3) | 7.7 | (0.3) | 9.8 | (0.5) | 9.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Hungary | 12.8 | (0.5) | 12.3 | (0.4) | 12.2 | (0.4) | 12.4 | (0.3) | 13.4 | (0.7) | 11.4 | (0.5) | 12.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Iceland | 10.1 | (0.1) | 10.4 | (0.1) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 11.0 | (0.1) | 9.8 | (0.0) | 10.3 | (0.0) | 11.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 13.7 | (0.2) | 14.4 | (0.2) | 14.5 | (0.2) | 14.7 | (0.2) | 12.6 | (0.5) | 14.5 | (0.2) | 15.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Israel | 11.0 | (0.3) | 10.8 | (0.3) | 10.6 | (0.2) | 11.0 | (0.2) | 11.1 | (0.5) | 10.6 | (0.4) | 10.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Italy | 9.4 | (0.1) | 10.0 | (0.1) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 11.3 | (0.2) | 8.7 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (0.2) | 12.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Japan | 10.6 | (0.2) | 11.6 | (0.3) | 12.1 | (0.3) | 12.4 | (0.3) | 10.0 | (0.4) | 12.0 | (0.5) | 13.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Korea | 15.3 | (0.3) | 16.1 | (0.3) | 16.4 | (0.3) | 16.6 | (0.4) | 14.0 | (0.5) | 17.0 | (0.4) | 16.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Luxembourg | 8.9 | (0.0) | 8.9 | (0.0) | 9.0 | (0.0) | 9.3 | (0.0) | 9.0 | (0.0) | 8.6 | (0.0) | 9.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 28.2 | (0.8) | 31.5 | (1.0) | 32.4 | (0.9) | 30.1 | (0.8) | 27.3 | (0.7) | 34.0 | (1.9) | 30.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Netherlands | 15.7 | (0.4) | 16.6 | (0.4) | 17.1 | (0.4) | 17.7 | (0.5) | 14.1 | (0.4) | 17.6 | (0.5) | 18.1 | (0.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 14.8 | (0.3) | 15.1 | (0.3) | 15.4 | (0.2) | 15.4 | (0.3) | 14.1 | (0.6) | 15.3 | (0.3) | 15.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Norway | 10.2 | (0.2) | 10.4 | (0.1) | 10.4 | (0.2) | 10.9 | (0.2) | 10.7 | (0.4) | 10.1 | (0.2) | 11.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Poland | 9.4 | (0.2) | 9.2 | (0.2) | 9.5 | (0.3) | 9.6 | (0.2) | 8.7 | (0.3) | 9.8 | (0.3) | 9.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Portugal | 8.2 | (0.3) | 8.5 | (0.2) | 8.8 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (0.2) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 9.0 | (0.3) | 10.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 13.2 | (0.3) | 13.0 | (0.4) | 13.4 | (0.3) | 13.4 | (0.3) | 12.8 | (0.6) | 13.6 | (0.4) | 13.1 | (0.4) |
|  | Slovenia | 9.8 | (0.1) | 10.4 | (0.1) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 11.4 | (0.1) | 9.5 | (0.1) | 10.2 | (0.1) | 12.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Spain | 11.7 | (0.6) | 12.1 | (0.5) | 12.7 | (0.3) | 13.6 | (0.3) | 11.6 | (1.3) | 11.8 | (0.2) | 14.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Sweden | 12.1 | (0.2) | 12.2 | (0.2) | 12.7 | (0.3) | 12.9 | (0.3) | 11.4 | (0.5) | 12.2 | (0.3) | 14.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 12.3 | (0.4) | 12.2 | (0.3) | 12.1 | (0.3) | 11.7 | (0.2) | 12.1 | (0.6) | 12.3 | (0.5) | 11.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Turkey | 19.3 | (0.9) | 18.0 | (0.6) | 17.4 | (0.6) | 15.1 | (0.7) | 20.7 | (1.4) | 16.9 | (0.8) | 14.2 | (1.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 14.9 | (0.2) | 15.1 | (0.2) | 15.0 | (0.2) | 14.2 | (0.2) | 14.5 | (0.4) | 15.4 | (0.1) | 13.8 | (0.4) |
|  | United States | 17.4 | (1.0) | 17.4 | (1.2) | 17.1 | (0.9) | 17.7 | (1.5) | 16.8 | (1.1) | 17.1 | (1.1) | 18.5 | (2.4) |
|  | OECD average | 12.9 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (0.1) | 13.5 | (0.1) | 13.5 | (0.1) | 12.5 | (0.1) | 13.4 | (0.1) | 13.8 | (0.1) |


| $\cdots$ Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ミ Argentina | 9.6 | (1.2) | 10.4 | (1.1) | 11.1 | (1.5) | 10.8 | (1.2) | 9.6 | (0.7) | 10.7 | (3.2) | 11.3 | (1.3) |
| ※ Brazil | 29.7 | (0.8) | 29.5 | (0.8) | 28.6 | (1.0) | 24.7 | (1.0) | 31.3 | (1.2) | 28.6 | (1.1) | 22.9 | (1.5) |
| Bulgaria | 14.7 | (2.0) | 14.5 | (1.6) | 15.5 | (2.0) | 14.0 | (0.7) | 13.8 | (2.8) | 16.5 | (3.3) | 13.7 | (0.7) |
| Colombia | 26.3 | (0.9) | 28.2 | (0.7) | 28.3 | (0.7) | 25.3 | (0.8) | 26.0 | (1.4) | 28.8 | (1.0) | 25.4 | (0.9) |
| Costa Rica | 17.8 | (0.8) | 18.3 | (0.9) | 20.1 | (1.6) | 25.4 | (9.1) | 16.5 | (1.0) | 19.7 | (1.4) | 25.3 | (9.1) |
| Croatia | 12.3 | (0.2) | 12.5 | (0.2) | 12.5 | (0.2) | 13.1 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.3) | 14.0 | (0.4) |
| Cyprus* | 7.4 | (0.0) | 7.8 | (0.0) | 8.1 | (0.0) | 8.5 | (0.0) | 7.0 | (0.0) | 8.1 | (0.0) | 8.9 | (0.0) |
| Hong Kong-China | 15.1 | (0.2) | 15.6 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 15.3 | (0.3) | 14.5 | (0.2) | 16.4 | (0.2) | 15.1 | (0.4) |
| Indonesia | 17.1 | (0.7) | 17.4 | (0.7) | 16.7 | (0.7) | 16.2 | (0.8) | 17.9 | (0.9) | 15.6 | (1.1) | 16.7 | (1.0) |
| Jordan | 17.3 | (0.4) | 17.3 | (0.4) | 17.4 | (0.5) | 16.2 | (0.6) | 16.7 | (0.8) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 15.0 | (1.0) |
| Kazakhstan | 9.5 | (0.3) | 9.9 | (0.2) | 10.2 | (0.2) | 10.4 | (0.4) | 9.2 | (0.5) | 9.8 | (0.4) | 10.8 | (0.5) |
| Latvia | 9.0 | (0.2) | 10.1 | (0.2) | 10.1 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (0.3) | 8.1 | (0.4) | 10.4 | (0.3) | 10.4 | (0.4) |
| Liechtenstein | 7.7 | (0.2) | 8.1 | (0.2) | 8.1 | (0.2) | 8.3 | (0.1) | C | C | 7.7 | (0.1) | c | C |
| Lithuania | 11.1 | (0.9) | 11.5 | (0.8) | 11.4 | (0.4) | 11.7 | (0.6) | 11.1 | (1.8) | 11.4 | (0.8) | 11.6 | (0.3) |
| Macao-China | 15.7 | (0.1) | 16.0 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.1) | 16.4 | (0.0) | 14.3 | (0.0) | 15.2 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 13.2 | (0.2) | 13.3 | (0.2) | 13.6 | (0.3) | 13.6 | (0.3) | 13.3 | (0.3) | 13.3 | (0.4) | 13.7 | (0.5) |
| Montenegro | 15.0 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 16.6 | (0.1) | 14.6 | (0.0) | 15.7 | (0.0) | 16.8 | (0.0) |
| Peru | 16.8 | (0.6) | 18.3 | (0.6) | 19.5 | (0.8) | 19.4 | (0.7) | 17.0 | (0.7) | 18.3 | (0.9) | 20.1 | (1.1) |
| Qatar | 13.2 | (0.2) | 14.8 | (0.2) | 14.3 | (0.2) | 13.8 | (0.2) | 12.5 | (0.0) | 11.8 | (0.0) | 16.0 | (0.0) |
| Romania | 17.2 | (0.6) | 16.0 | (0.4) | 15.7 | (0.5) | 15.4 | (0.4) | 18.1 | (0.9) | 15.4 | (0.5) | 15.0 | (0.7) |
| Russian Federation | 12.7 | (0.3) | 14.5 | (0.3) | 14.9 | (0.2) | 14.9 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.8) | 14.4 | (0.4) | 15.5 | (0.3) |
| Serbia | 11.0 | (0.3) | 11.2 | (0.3) | 11.5 | (0.3) | 12.3 | (0.4) | 10.5 | (0.4) | 11.3 | (0.6) | 13.3 | (0.6) |
| Shanghai-China | 13.3 | (0.7) | 12.5 | (0.5) | 11.6 | (0.3) | 11.2 | (0.3) | 14.7 | (0.8) | 11.5 | (0.6) | 10.5 | (0.3) |
| Singapore | 14.2 | (0.1) | 14.4 | (0.1) | 14.8 | (0.3) | 15.0 | (1.0) | 14.0 | (0.0) | 14.3 | (0.1) | 15.9 | (1.3) |
| Chinese Taipei | 17.4 | (0.4) | 17.5 | (0.3) | 17.4 | (0.3) | 17.3 | (0.3) | 18.0 | (0.7) | 16.6 | (0.5) | 18.0 | (0.5) |
| Thailand | 19.5 | (0.5) | 20.3 | (0.5) | 20.5 | (0.5) | 20.8 | (0.6) | 19.8 | (0.7) | 20.0 | (0.8) | 21.1 | (0.7) |
| Tunisia | 11.6 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.6) | 12.4 | (1.0) | 12.7 | (1.3) | 11.4 | (0.3) | 11.7 | (0.3) | 14.1 | (2.9) |
| United Arab Emirates | 12.2 | (0.3) | 12.4 | (0.3) | 12.1 | (0.4) | 11.9 | (0.4) | 12.0 | (0.4) | 12.4 | (0.4) | 12.0 | (0.5) |
| Uruguay | 15.2 | (0.5) | 16.3 | (0.4) | 16.2 | (0.4) | 14.3 | (0.6) | 15.5 | (0.6) | 16.9 | (0.6) | 13.2 | (0.7) |
| Viet Nam | 17.6 | (0.4) | 19.0 | (0.4) | 19.5 | (0.5) | 19.1 | (0.8) | 18.0 | (0.5) | 19.4 | (0.6) | 19.2 | (1.2) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
*See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
StatLink ज्ञाish http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
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StatLink 节亚络 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957460
[Part 3/4]
Student-teacher ratio, by school features
Table IV.3.9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | School principals' report on the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Student-mathematics teacher ratio in the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 88.8 | (3.0) | 90.2 | (2.1) | 91.2 | (1.5) | 94.6 | (2.0) | 86.8 | (4.8) | 89.6 | (1.9) | 98.2 | (3.0) |
| U | Austria | 81.2 | (7.2) | 101.7 | (6.3) | 103.0 | (6.3) | 100.2 | (6.6) | 64.8 | (11.9) | 114.5 | (8.8) | 103.0 | (12.7) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 91.0 | (4.9) | 88.8 | (2.4) | 83.8 | (1.9) | 83.2 | (2.2) | 96.0 | (7.6) | 85.9 | (3.3) | 80.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Canada | 118.7 | (6.9) | 121.4 | (4.0) | 126.0 | (6.3) | 123.8 | (3.2) | 128.1 | (17.2) | 116.2 | (4.1) | 130.6 | (4.5) |
|  | Chile | 213.8 | (7.2) | 230.0 | (7.7) | 230.1 | (8.2) | 219.9 | (7.9) | 219.4 | (7.4) | 226.3 | (14.4) | 227.4 | (11.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 110.0 | (6.2) | 117.9 | (7.2) | 111.6 | (6.7) | 102.5 | (5.1) | 119.2 | (9.6) | 117.3 | (9.5) | 83.8 | (5.3) |
|  | Denmark | 35.3 | (1.4) | 37.2 | (1.3) | 36.9 | (1.3) | 40.2 | (1.4) | 37.0 | (2.9) | 35.0 | (1.3) | 44.0 | (2.3) |
|  | Estonia | 124.2 | (3.8) | 136.2 | (3.0) | 147.1 | (3.3) | 156.2 | (2.9) | 111.7 | (7.5) | 134.4 | (3.9) | 180.6 | (4.1) |
|  | Finland | 80.7 | (2.6) | 83.1 | (2.4) | 83.3 | (2.8) | 85.1 | (2.4) | 77.6 | (5.4) | 82.8 | (3.1) | 89.5 | (5.4) |
|  | France | 111.8 | (2.5) | 114.9 | (2.7) | 111.8 | (3.1) | 106.4 | (3.2) | 108.0 | (3.2) | 118.7 | (4.3) | 101.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Germany | 63.7 | (6.0) | 67.6 | (4.1) | 67.8 | (2.7) | 72.1 | (2.2) | 66.1 | (11.4) | 65.7 | (4.8) | 77.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Greece | 68.4 | (2.0) | 68.8 | (2.5) | 68.2 | (1.8) | 64.7 | (1.6) | 70.8 | (2.8) | 68.0 | (2.9) | 63.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Hungary | 133.7 | (7.3) | 119.2 | (5.0) | 112.5 | (5.0) | 102.1 | (4.7) | 143.4 | (10.0) | 117.0 | (9.6) | 94.4 | (4.2) |
|  | Iceland | 29.5 | (0.8) | 32.3 | (0.8) | 35.3 | (0.8) | 38.3 | (0.9) | 24.7 | (0.1) | 30.0 | (0.2) | 48.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 76.7 | (3.4) | 78.5 | (3.4) | 78.1 | (2.7) | 79.0 | (2.9) | 71.8 | (3.8) | 80.1 | (4.3) | 78.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Israel | 84.7 | (3.6) | 85.4 | (3.0) | 84.2 | (2.8) | 90.4 | (2.9) | 86.4 | (6.0) | 83.8 | (4.4) | 88.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Italy | 100.2 | (1.8) | 98.8 | (2.0) | 96.1 | (2.3) | 92.1 | (5.1) | 105.5 | (2.7) | 96.1 | (1.7) | 89.7 | (7.9) |
|  | Japan | 99.5 | (2.9) | 100.6 | (3.2) | 96.6 | (2.9) | 89.0 | (2.9) | 106.1 | (5.5) | 99.4 | (4.7) | 82.0 | (3.8) |
|  | Korea | 149.1 | (4.1) | 135.2 | (3.5) | 126.6 | (3.2) | 119.3 | (3.8) | 172.6 | (8.4) | 122.5 | (4.4) | 110.7 | (6.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 124.6 | (1.5) | 118.5 | (2.1) | 108.0 | (2.2) | 91.1 | (1.2) | 127.5 | (0.2) | 116.4 | (0.4) | 88.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 150.4 | (5.0) | 194.6 | (6.2) | 204.1 | (5.3) | 189.4 | (5.0) | 144.2 | (6.2) | 210.5 | (9.9) | 198.6 | (6.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 152.3 | (5.9) | 156.1 | (5.3) | 161.6 | (4.5) | 161.2 | (5.3) | 138.4 | (8.9) | 162.1 | (6.4) | 166.2 | (8.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 116.8 | (4.4) | 120.0 | (3.9) | 121.1 | (3.2) | 119.2 | (3.2) | 110.6 | (7.6) | 124.0 | (4.6) | 115.6 | (3.9) |
|  | Norway | 33.6 | (0.9) | 34.6 | (0.9) | 35.2 | (1.1) | 39.9 | (1.3) | 31.8 | (2.8) | 33.7 | (1.0) | 46.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Poland | 89.6 | (2.8) | 92.6 | (2.8) | 97.0 | (2.7) | 99.3 | (2.6) | 81.5 | (4.8) | 96.3 | (3.3) | 108.1 | (4.8) |
|  | Portugal | 72.2 | (2.9) | 76.4 | (2.4) | 79.6 | (2.2) | 97.6 | (4.8) | 66.7 | (5.0) | 80.3 | (2.5) | 107.0 | (7.8) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 128.1 | (9.7) | 139.5 | (8.4) | 129.5 | (6.4) | 112.8 | (4.5) | 149.2 | (19.1) | 129.5 | (8.3) | 102.6 | (5.9) |
|  | Slovenia | 123.6 | (1.7) | 123.3 | (2.1) | 119.4 | (1.8) | 117.9 | (1.2) | 126.9 | (1.4) | 120.8 | (1.3) | 116.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 100.4 | (3.6) | 107.6 | (4.7) | 119.7 | (8.7) | 128.8 | (13.5) | 93.8 | (3.5) | 105.3 | (4.4) | 149.7 | (22.4) |
|  | Sweden | 55.1 | (3.6) | 56.0 | (2.9) | 57.4 | (3.2) | 59.6 | (2.6) | 49.9 | (3.9) | 56.7 | (4.4) | 63.2 | (3.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 80.2 | (19.6) | 91.3 | (20.3) | 93.9 | (18.8) | 86.9 | (11.0) | 102.4 | (48.0) | 69.8 | (18.0) | 105.6 | (19.7) |
|  | Turkey | 218.2 | (14.2) | 192.7 | (11.3) | 179.8 | (10.9) | 133.8 | (7.8) | 237.5 | (20.0) | 189.1 | (18.1) | 97.2 | (8.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 128.0 | (3.0) | 129.8 | (2.7) | 130.3 | (2.1) | 130.9 | (3.2) | 123.3 | (6.9) | 132.4 | (1.7) | 129.0 | (5.2) |
|  | United States | 120.7 | (6.0) | 121.5 | (5.2) | 121.8 | (5.1) | 121.0 | (3.7) | 118.2 | (8.4) | 122.1 | (8.1) | 122.1 | (4.5) |
|  | OECD average | 104.6 | (1.0) | 107.7 | (1.0) | 107.3 | (0.9) | 104.4 | (0.8) | 105.8 | (2.0) | 106.8 | (1.2) | 105.5 | (1.3) |


| $\sim$ | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { S }}{ }$ | Argentina | 95.0 | (5.2) | 98.6 | (4.5) | 104.6 | (4.7) | 103.7 | (6.6) | 97.1 | (6.5) | 95.5 | (7.3) | 108.2 | (8.5) |
| ※ | Brazil | 215.7 | (12.8) | 222.9 | (13.7) | 232.7 | (15.5) | 223.7 | (17.3) | 202.1 | (12.8) | 235.5 | (17.6) | 231.2 | (33.6) |
|  | Bulgaria | 165.6 | (7.3) | 161.2 | (6.3) | 163.8 | (7.3) | 155.3 | (5.6) | 164.8 | (9.8) | 160.6 | (6.1) | 159.0 | (10.6) |
|  | Colombia | 257.4 | (12.4) | 258.1 | (10.3) | 250.2 | (9.0) | 221.3 | (10.5) | 272.6 | (18.9) | 255.9 | (13.1) | 211.1 | (12.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 182.0 | (9.9) | 205.7 | (11.0) | 204.1 | (9.8) | 200.0 | (19.1) | 171.1 | (11.2) | 219.6 | (16.8) | 190.6 | (20.7) |
|  | Croatia | 175.5 | (4.4) | 169.3 | (4.5) | 164.0 | (4.4) | 150.1 | (4.0) | 188.3 | (5.9) | 159.8 | (7.1) | 140.0 | (5.4) |
|  | Cyprus* | 80.7 | (0.2) | 82.0 | (0.3) | 81.5 | (0.3) | 80.3 | (0.3) | 80.2 | (0.1) | 83.5 | (0.0) | 79.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 92.5 | (1.7) | 96.2 | (1.9) | 98.1 | (1.9) | 99.9 | (2.9) | 87.5 | (2.2) | 101.1 | (3.0) | 101.9 | (3.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 168.3 | (8.2) | 169.5 | (7.9) | 165.3 | (7.5) | 163.2 | (8.9) | 175.6 | (11.5) | 152.5 | (11.3) | 168.6 | (11.4) |
|  | Jordan | 158.9 | (4.2) | 159.9 | (3.6) | 158.6 | (4.6) | 151.8 | (4.9) | 160.9 | (9.5) | 161.1 | (4.3) | 142.2 | (9.3) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 142.9 | (7.1) | 151.6 | (6.9) | 156.2 | (8.2) | 148.7 | (8.0) | 136.3 | (9.8) | 158.8 | (12.7) | 147.5 | (8.1) |
|  | Latvia | 102.3 | (2.9) | 120.0 | (4.0) | 120.1 | (3.7) | 125.4 | (5.0) | 84.1 | (5.2) | 127.3 | (5.7) | 119.9 | (6.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 34.3 | (1.9) | 39.0 | (2.2) | 43.4 | (2.2) | 47.7 | (1.9) | c | c | 33.4 | (0.6) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 118.9 | (2.8) | 124.4 | (2.1) | 123.3 | (2.5) | 120.2 | (2.6) | 122.6 | (5.9) | 123.0 | (2.9) | 118.6 | (4.7) |
|  | Macao-China | 93.9 | (0.9) | 95.7 | (0.9) | 96.3 | (1.0) | 98.1 | (1.0) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 79.2 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 99.5 | (2.9) | 101.2 | (2.6) | 100.8 | (2.8) | 101.8 | (3.3) | 97.4 | (4.3) | 104.1 | (3.7) | 99.2 | (5.1) |
|  | Montenegro | 242.1 | (6.7) | 230.0 | (6.0) | 209.2 | (5.2) | 210.9 | (6.4) | 200.0 | (0.3) | 362.5 | (2.4) | 164.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 120.9 | (8.7) | 135.8 | (11.2) | 136.5 | (8.2) | 134.8 | (8.8) | 124.2 | (13.9) | 139.4 | (12.7) | 132.7 | (11.5) |
|  | Qatar | 98.1 | (1.2) | 116.9 | (1.5) | 115.5 | (1.3) | 106.6 | (0.9) | 112.4 | (0.4) | 91.1 | (0.2) | 114.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 193.5 | (6.2) | 188.5 | (6.4) | 183.0 | (4.8) | 166.9 | (4.8) | 203.1 | (9.0) | 179.1 | (6.6) | 165.9 | (8.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 139.5 | (6.6) | 159.0 | (5.7) | 165.7 | (5.8) | 163.6 | (5.4) | 127.7 | (8.4) | 167.1 | (8.7) | 161.1 | (5.2) |
|  | Serbia | 158.0 | (6.2) | 159.9 | (6.6) | 156.9 | (6.4) | 155.0 | (9.9) | 150.7 | (7.9) | 163.7 | (9.9) | 153.2 | (19.2) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 151.1 | (19.2) | 135.3 | (13.4) | 104.0 | (7.9) | 81.8 | (4.2) | 199.7 | (27.1) | 100.5 | (15.2) | 65.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Singapore | 82.6 | (0.7) | 83.7 | (0.9) | 86.1 | (1.7) | 91.2 | (4.2) | 85.2 | (0.1) | 79.3 | (0.6) | 99.2 | (5.8) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 202.9 | (8.7) | 207.5 | (18.8) | 173.3 | (5.2) | 152.4 | (8.0) | 225.6 | (18.5) | 191.8 | (28.0) | 122.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Thailand | 305.8 | (20.8) | 313.8 | (20.3) | 300.8 | (23.4) | 234.3 | (14.4) | 339.6 | (31.7) | 315.6 | (45.1) | 192.9 | (15.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 109.3 | (2.3) | 109.0 | (1.9) | 106.9 | (2.0) | 103.9 | (2.2) | 110.7 | (3.6) | 109.0 | (2.7) | 101.3 | (3.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 93.0 | (2.6) | 98.9 | (3.3) | 103.9 | (4.9) | 108.1 | (5.1) | 89.8 | (3.6) | 95.3 | (4.4) | 114.7 | (7.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 159.3 | (4.9) | 168.3 | (5.2) | 167.2 | (5.1) | 147.2 | (7.6) | 166.7 | (7.4) | 166.7 | (7.9) | 140.1 | (11.3) |
|  | Viet Nam | 115.7 | (4.1) | 123.4 | (4.4) | 123.0 | (4.0) | 115.3 | (4.2) | 122.8 | (6.0) | 116.5 | (3.5) | 117.7 | (7.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 4/4]
Student-teacher ratio, by school features
Table IV.3.9 Results based on school principals' reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

［Part 1／2］
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance
Table IV．3．10 Results based on school principals＇reports


Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 徏定地 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957460
[Part 2/2]
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance
Table IV.3.10 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (ainा Sh http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 1/2]
Index of teacher shortage, by school features
Table IV.3.11 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of teacher shortage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarterof ESCS |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Second quarter } \\ \text { of ESCS } \end{gathered}$ |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 0.38 | (0.05) | 0.29 | (0.04) | 0.14 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.05) | 0.53 | (0.07) | 0.27 | (0.05) | -0.27 | (0.06) |
| A Austria | 0.00 | (0.09) | -0.15 | (0.09) | -0.15 | (0.10) | -0.23 | (0.11) | 0.03 | (0.14) | -0.18 | (0.12) | -0.24 | (0.19) |
| - Belgium | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.34 | (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.07) | 0.18 | (0.07) | 0.53 | (0.10) | 0.25 | (0.10) | 0.05 | (0.10) |
| Canada | -0.22 | (0.05) | -0.28 | (0.04) | -0.30 | (0.05) | -0.40 | (0.04) | -0.15 | (0.10) | -0.29 | (0.05) | -0.44 | (0.08) |
| Chile | 0.77 | (0.13) | 0.70 | (0.11) | 0.61 | (0.12) | 0.37 | (0.12) | 0.80 | (0.15) | 0.87 | (0.17) | 0.21 | (0.15) |
| Czech Republic | -0.28 | (0.08) | -0.37 | (0.05) | -0.41 | (0.05) | -0.64 | (0.04) | -0.27 | (0.12) | -0.32 | (0.06) | -0.87 | (0.07) |
| Denmark | -0.08 | (0.06) | -0.17 | (0.06) | -0.20 | (0.06) | -0.28 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.12) | -0.12 | (0.06) | -0.44 | (0.12) |
| Estonia | -0.02 | (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.09) |
| Finland | -0.40 | (0.05) | -0.45 | (0.04) | -0.44 | (0.04) | -0.48 | (0.04) | -0.22 | (0.11) | -0.52 | (0.05) | -0.33 | (0.07) |
| France | -0.19 | (0.07) | -0.14 | (0.07) | -0.17 | (0.07) | -0.22 | (0.08) | -0.18 | (0.10) | -0.11 | (0.09) | -0.28 | (0.11) |
| Germany | 0.53 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.08) | 0.30 | (0.09) | 0.54 | (0.10) | 0.44 | (0.09) | 0.21 | (0.13) |
| Greece | -0.37 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.09) | -0.45 | (0.07) | -0.51 | (0.08) | -0.30 | (0.12) | -0.43 | (0.11) | -0.50 | (0.12) |
| Hungary | -0.55 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.06) | -0.70 | (0.05) | -0.74 | (0.06) | -0.38 | (0.11) | -0.76 | (0.07) | -0.78 | (0.07) |
| Iceland | 0.30 | (0.03) | 0.23 | (0.03) | 0.08 | (0.03) | 0.12 | (0.03) | 0.38 | (0.01) | 0.27 | (0.00) | -0.11 | (0.01) |
| Ireland | -0.02 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.07) | -0.16 | (0.07) | -0.30 | (0.07) | 0.07 | (0.13) | -0.07 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.11) |
| Israel | 0.64 | (0.11) | 0.69 | (0.11) | 0.67 | (0.09) | 0.76 | (0.10) | 0.66 | (0.20) | 0.63 | (0.14) | 0.80 | (0.13) |
| Italy | 0.26 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.05) | 0.25 | (0.04) | 0.24 | (0.05) | 0.21 | (0.10) | 0.26 | (0.05) | 0.27 | (0.07) |
| Japan | -0.22 | (0.08) | -0.28 | (0.07) | -0.29 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.12) | -0.30 | (0.11) | -0.41 | (0.10) |
| Korea | -0.01 | (0.09) | 0.03 | (0.08) | 0.09 | (0.09) | 0.13 | (0.11) | -0.13 | (0.11) | 0.14 | (0.12) | 0.11 | (0.19) |
| Luxembourg | 1.31 | (0.02) | 1.22 | (0.02) | 1.09 | (0.02) | 0.87 | (0.02) | 1.34 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 0.78 | (0.04) | 0.62 | (0.04) | 0.49 | (0.05) | 0.23 | (0.05) | 0.83 | (0.05) | 0.54 | (0.07) | 0.18 | (0.07) |
| Netherlands | 0.59 | (0.09) | 0.62 | (0.08) | 0.61 | (0.08) | 0.59 | (0.10) | 0.56 | (0.15) | 0.66 | (0.08) | 0.51 | (0.18) |
| New Zealand | 0.24 | (0.08) | 0.10 | (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.07) | -0.09 | (0.10) | 0.55 | (0.17) | 0.06 | (0.09) | -0.25 | (0.13) |
| Norway | 0.37 | (0.07) | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.32 | (0.08) | 0.22 | (0.08) | 0.37 | (0.22) | 0.34 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.14) |
| Poland | -1.01 | (0.03) | -1.02 | (0.02) | -1.02 | (0.02) | -1.02 | (0.02) | -0.99 | (0.05) | -1.03 | (0.03) | -1.01 | (0.04) |
| Portugal | -0.79 | (0.08) | -0.79 | (0.06) | -0.79 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.07) | -0.75 | (0.14) | -0.85 | (0.05) | -0.80 | (0.11) |
| Slovak Republic | -0.13 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.05) | -0.40 | (0.05) | -0.52 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.08) | -0.40 | (0.05) | -0.65 | (0.12) |
| Slovenia | -0.73 | (0.02) | -0.68 | (0.02) | -0.67 | (0.02) | -0.63 | (0.02) | -0.73 | (0.01) | -0.66 | (0.02) | -0.66 | (0.01) |
| Spain | -0.70 | (0.04) | -0.70 | (0.04) | -0.75 | (0.03) | -0.79 | (0.03) | -0.68 | (0.06) | -0.69 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.06) |
| Sweden | 0.06 | (0.09) | -0.04 | (0.07) | -0.07 | (0.07) | -0.20 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.17) | -0.06 | (0.09) | -0.39 | (0.13) |
| Switzerland | 0.06 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.05) | 0.07 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.11) | 0.17 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.12) |
| Turkey | 1.04 | (0.08) | 0.95 | (0.07) | 0.86 | (0.08) | 0.66 | (0.10) | 1.07 | (0.14) | 1.00 | (0.13) | 0.42 | (0.17) |
| United Kingdom | -0.07 | (0.08) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.19 | (0.06) | -0.37 | (0.06) | -0.08 | (0.14) | -0.08 | (0.09) | -0.51 | (0.08) |
| United States | -0.28 | (0.12) | -0.42 | (0.08) | -0.47 | (0.06) | -0.52 | (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.17) | -0.52 | (0.09) | -0.61 | (0.11) |
| OECD average | 0.05 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.05 | (0.01) | -0.13 | (0.01) | 0.11 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.01) | -0.21 | (0.02) |
| \% Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Argentina | -0.08 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.10) | -0.07 | (0.09) | -0.16 | (0.10) | -0.11 | (0.12) | -0.04 | (0.14) | -0.16 | (0.14) |
| ¿ Brazil | 0.42 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.12 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.07) | 0.53 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.08) | -0.27 | (0.13) |
| Bulgaria | -0.77 | (0.05) | -0.80 | (0.04) | -0.80 | (0.04) | -0.86 | (0.04) | -0.78 | (0.06) | -0.78 | (0.07) | -0.85 | (0.06) |
| Colombia | 0.65 | (0.13) | 0.77 | (0.11) | 0.72 | (0.15) | 0.52 | (0.22) | 0.57 | (0.17) | 0.84 | (0.12) | 0.52 | (0.32) |
| Costa Rica | 0.06 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.07) | -0.07 | (0.09) | -0.03 | (0.10) | 0.03 | (0.10) | -0.08 | (0.15) |
| Croatia | -0.35 | (0.07) | -0.44 | (0.06) | -0.41 | (0.06) | -0.54 | (0.08) | -0.32 | (0.10) | -0.43 | (0.09) | -0.60 | (0.13) |
| Cyprus* | -0.52 | (0.03) | -0.50 | (0.04) | -0.55 | (0.03) | -0.50 | (0.03) | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.58 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | -0.10 | (0.10) | -0.16 | (0.08) | -0.27 | (0.07) | -0.36 | (0.10) | 0.08 | (0.14) | -0.40 | (0.09) | -0.39 | (0.16) |
| Indonesia | 0.48 | (0.10) | 0.34 | (0.10) | 0.28 | (0.08) | -0.04 | (0.12) | 0.53 | (0.15) | 0.30 | (0.10) | -0.16 | (0.13) |
| Jordan | 1.15 | (0.12) | 1.04 | (0.11) | 0.98 | (0.10) | 0.89 | (0.12) | 1.25 | (0.24) | 1.02 | (0.13) | 0.76 | (0.26) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.31 | (0.12) | 0.23 | (0.11) | 0.32 | (0.12) | 0.28 | (0.12) | 0.34 | (0.23) | 0.14 | (0.14) | 0.45 | (0.21) |
| Latvia | -0.48 | (0.07) | -0.39 | (0.07) | -0.43 | (0.07) | -0.33 | (0.09) | -0.41 | (0.11) | -0.46 | (0.09) | -0.32 | (0.13) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.17 | (0.09) | -0.14 | (0.09) | 0.12 | (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.27 | (0.03) | c | c |
| Lithuania | -0.63 | (0.05) | -0.64 | (0.05) | -0.69 | (0.05) | -0.68 | (0.05) | -0.58 | (0.10) | -0.67 | (0.05) | -0.71 | (0.08) |
| Macao-China | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.07 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.17 | (0.00) | -0.12 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.23 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.11) | 0.19 | (0.10) | 0.20 | (0.09) | 0.27 | (0.15) |
| Montenegro | -0.43 | (0.02) | -0.47 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.02) | -0.64 | (0.02) | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.00) | -0.79 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 0.84 | (0.10) | 0.72 | (0.09) | 0.54 | (0.09) | 0.36 | (0.12) | 0.81 | (0.12) | 0.73 | (0.12) | 0.30 | (0.15) |
| Qatar | 0.04 | (0.02) | -0.24 | (0.02) | -0.20 | (0.02) | -0.14 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.00) | -0.06 | (0.00) | -0.21 | (0.00) |
| Romania | -0.49 | (0.06) | -0.50 | (0.05) | -0.54 | (0.06) | -0.65 | (0.07) | -0.48 | (0.08) | -0.48 | (0.08) | -0.70 | (0.12) |
| Russian Federation | 0.42 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.08) | 0.36 | (0.09) | 0.32 | (0.11) | 0.64 | (0.15) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.39 | (0.18) |
| Serbia | -0.61 | (0.08) | -0.69 | (0.06) | -0.76 | (0.05) | -0.90 | (0.03) | -0.40 | (0.12) | -0.85 | (0.07) | -1.02 | (0.04) |
| Shanghai-China | 0.98 | (0.12) | 0.77 | (0.10) | 0.65 | (0.11) | 0.60 | (0.12) | 1.11 | (0.18) | 0.77 | (0.15) | 0.41 | (0.17) |
| Singapore | 0.14 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.02) | 0.17 | (0.02) | 0.04 | (0.04) | 0.14 | (0.00) | 0.14 | (0.01) | 0.10 | (0.04) |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.11 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.10) | -0.23 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.08) | 0.33 | (0.19) | -0.04 | (0.17) | -0.83 | (0.08) |
| Thailand | 0.99 | (0.10) | 1.01 | (0.09) | 0.90 | (0.10) | 0.88 | (0.11) | 1.05 | (0.12) | 0.86 | (0.16) | 0.90 | (0.17) |
| Tunisia | -0.12 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.08) | -0.20 | (0.12) | -0.14 | (0.15) | 0.00 | (0.11) | -0.26 | (0.18) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.28 | (0.09) | 0.16 | (0.09) | 0.12 | (0.09) | 0.02 | (0.10) | 0.27 | (0.11) | 0.22 | (0.13) | -0.03 | (0.14) |
| Uruguay | 0.55 | (0.10) | 0.43 | (0.07) | 0.39 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.11) | 0.58 | (0.13) | 0.38 | (0.10) | -0.12 | (0.14) |
| Viet Nam | 0.55 | (0.13) | 0.51 | (0.12) | 0.35 | (0.10) | 0.22 | (0.11) | 0.64 | (0.16) | 0.36 | (0.15) | 0.12 | (0.15) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 司ill sh http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 2/2]
Index of teacher shortage, by school features
Table IV.3.11 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of teacher shortage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than $\mathbf{3 0 0 0}$ people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town ( $\mathbf{3} 000$ to abou 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 0.41 | (0.04) | -0.09 | (0.06) | 0.18 | (0.04) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 0.49 | (0.17) | 0.58 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.04) |
| Austria | -0.11 | (0.09) | -0.37 | (0.25) | 0.26 | (0.17) | -0.15 | (0.09) | -0.13 | (0.20) | -0.10 | (0.12) | -0.18 | (0.14) |
| - Belgium | 0.33 | (0.12) | 0.24 | (0.08) | 0.56 | (0.10) | 0.23 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.31) | 0.24 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.12) |
| Canada | -0.30 | (0.04) | -0.37 | (0.14) | 0.03 | (0.06) | -0.35 | (0.04) | -0.17 | (0.11) | -0.18 | (0.07) | -0.40 | (0.06) |
| Chile | 0.88 | (0.17) | 0.40 | (0.11) | 1.00 | (0.21) | 0.59 | (0.10) | 1.46 | (0.46) | 0.49 | (0.15) | 0.62 | (0.13) |
| Czech Republic | -0.39 | (0.05) | -0.79 | (0.12) | -0.21 | (0.07) | -0.69 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.16) | -0.48 | (0.05) | -0.41 | (0.11) |
| Denmark | -0.11 | (0.06) | -0.39 | (0.11) | -0.18 | (0.05) | c | c | -0.09 | (0.08) | -0.21 | (0.07) | -0.19 | (0.13) |
| Estonia | 0.01 | (0.05) | -0.35 | (0.28) | 0.01 | (0.05) | -0.18 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.11) | -0.07 | (0.06) | 0.07 | (0.08) |
| Finland | -0.44 | (0.04) | -0.35 | (0.16) | -0.44 | (0.04) | c | c | -0.58 | (0.15) | -0.35 | (0.05) | -0.62 | (0.05) |
| France | -0.22 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.19) | -0.24 | (0.08) | -0.15 | (0.07) | -0.09 | (0.21) | -0.17 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.17) |
| Germany | 0.44 | (0.06) | 0.03 | (0.23) | 0.42 | (0.06) | 0.30 | (0.37) | c | c | 0.48 | (0.08) | 0.29 | (0.12) |
| Greece | -0.37 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.41 | (0.13) | -0.42 | (0.07) | -0.24 | (0.16) | -0.41 | (0.09) | -0.49 | (0.14) |
| Hungary | -0.68 | (0.06) | -0.47 | (0.12) | -0.59 | (0.14) | -0.66 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.16) | -0.61 | (0.07) | -0.75 | (0.07) |
| Iceland | 0.18 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.18 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.51 | (0.01) | 0.15 | (0.01) | 0.01 | (0.01) |
| Ireland | -0.15 | (0.11) | -0.10 | (0.09) | -0.14 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.15) | -0.05 | (0.08) | -0.35 | (0.12) |
| Israel | 0.69 | (0.09) | c | c | 0.90 | (0.11) | 0.66 | (0.09) | 0.78 | (0.18) | 0.76 | (0.15) | 0.55 | (0.14) |
| Italy | 0.29 | (0.04) | -0.27 | (0.18) | 0.21 | (0.16) | 0.25 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.24) | 0.28 | (0.05) | 0.20 | (0.06) |
| Japan | -0.27 | (0.08) | -0.33 | (0.10) | c | c | -0.29 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.38 | (0.13) | -0.25 | (0.07) |
| Korea | 0.03 | (0.11) | 0.10 | (0.12) | -0.19 | (0.29) | 0.08 | (0.08) | c | c | 0.30 | (0.18) | 0.04 | (0.09) |
| Luxembourg | 1.33 | (0.00) | -0.08 | (0.00) | 1.22 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.00) | c | c | 1.12 | (0.00) | c | c |
| Mexico | 0.63 | (0.04) | -0.07 | (0.09) | 0.72 | (0.05) | 0.42 | (0.05) | 0.84 | (0.07) | 0.62 | (0.06) | 0.34 | (0.06) |
| Netherlands | 0.59 | (0.15) | 0.59 | (0.09) | 0.57 | (0.08) | 0.67 | (0.12) | c |  | 0.60 | (0.09) | 0.59 | (0.16) |
| New Zealand | 0.12 | (0.08) | -0.40 | (0.32) | 0.09 | (0.09) | 0.08 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.18) | 0.35 | (0.13) | -0.14 | (0.08) |
| Norway | 0.32 | (0.07) | c | c | 0.31 | (0.07) | c | c | 0.62 | (0.12) | 0.32 | (0.09) | 0.00 | (0.13) |
| Poland | -1.02 | (0.02) | -1.06 | (0.03) | -1.02 | (0.02) | c | c | -1.01 | (0.04) | -1.03 | (0.03) | -1.00 | (0.05) |
| Portugal | -0.79 | (0.06) | -0.91 | (0.09) | -0.77 | (0.09) | -0.83 | (0.06) | -0.83 | (0.26) | -0.79 | (0.07) | -0.84 | (0.10) |
| Slovak Republic | -0.34 | (0.05) | -0.40 | (0.22) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.51 | (0.07) | 0.26 | (0.12) | -0.44 | (0.06) | -0.42 | (0.14) |
| Slovenia | -0.69 | (0.01) | -0.38 | (0.03) | -0.72 | (0.15) | -0.68 | (0.01) | -0.32 | (0.29) | -0.73 | (0.01) | -0.62 | (0.02) |
| Spain | -0.70 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.04) | -0.73 | (0.03) | c | c | -0.49 | (0.16) | -0.74 | (0.04) | -0.75 | (0.06) |
| Sweden | -0.05 | (0.07) | -0.06 | (0.19) | -0.05 | (0.07) | -0.34 | (0.19) | 0.21 | (0.17) | -0.10 | (0.08) | -0.14 | (0.13) |
| Switzerland | 0.07 | (0.05) | -0.13 | (0.29) | 0.12 | (0.05) | -0.19 | (0.16) | 0.03 | (0.18) | 0.07 | (0.06) | -0.01 | (0.19) |
| Turkey | 0.89 | (0.06) | c | c | 0.87 | (0.13) | 0.88 | (0.07) | 1.03 | (0.20) | 0.94 | (0.11) | 0.83 | (0.10) |
| United Kingdom | -0.09 | (0.07) | -0.32 | (0.11) | c | c | -0.18 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.16) | -0.13 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.10) |
| United States | -0.42 | (0.07) | -0.24 | (0.24) | -0.21 | (0.12) | -0.45 | (0.07) | -0.37 | (0.29) | -0.47 | (0.09) | -0.37 | (0.12) |
| OECD average | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.25 | (0.03) | 0.05 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.08 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.14 | (0.02) |
| $\because$ Albania | -0.22 | (0.07) | -0.43 | (0.33) | -0.14 | (0.10) | -0.30 | (0.09) | -0.09 | (0.13) | -0.38 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.15) |
| Argentina | -0.02 | (0.10) | -0.24 | (0.14) | 0.02 | (0.11) | -0.18 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.14) | -0.11 | (0.11) | -0.07 | (0.13) |
| ¿ Brazil | 0.34 | (0.06) | -0.42 | (0.15) | 0.19 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.57 | (0.20) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 0.03 | (0.07) |
| Bulgaria | -0.80 | (0.04) | c | c | -0.77 | (0.09) | -0.81 | (0.04) | -0.49 | (0.22) | -0.80 | (0.05) | -0.85 | (0.05) |
| Colombia | 0.74 | (0.11) | 0.35 | (0.51) | 0.64 | (0.12) | 0.68 | (0.14) | 0.69 | (0.24) | 1.08 | (0.26) | 0.43 | (0.11) |
| Costa Rica | 0.03 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.19) | -0.05 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.09) | -0.01 | (0.13) | 0.03 | (0.09) | -0.22 | (0.15) |
| Croatia | -0.43 | (0.06) | c |  | c | c | -0.43 | (0.06) | c | c | -0.38 | (0.07) | -0.54 | (0.10) |
| Cyprus* | -0.44 | (0.00) | -0.93 | (0.00) | -0.49 | (0.03) | -0.52 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.01) | -0.51 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | -0.34 | (0.37) | -0.21 | (0.07) | -0.20 | (0.07) | -0.24 | (0.07) | c | c | c | c | -0.23 | (0.07) |
| Indonesia | 0.16 | (0.09) | 0.41 | (0.13) | 0.55 | (0.11) | 0.01 | (0.09) | 0.55 | (0.18) | 0.32 | (0.10) | -0.26 | (0.13) |
| Jordan | 1.12 | (0.10) | 0.54 | (0.28) | 1.02 | (0.09) | c | c | 1.08 | (0.28) | 1.09 | (0.17) | 0.93 | (0.17) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.28 | (0.11) | 0.55 | (0.23) | 0.26 | (0.11) | 0.35 | (0.13) | 0.27 | (0.19) | 0.07 | (0.21) | 0.42 | (0.15) |
| Latvia | -0.39 | (0.06) | c | c | -0.42 | (0.06) | -0.10 | (0.24) | -0.46 | (0.11) | -0.51 | (0.08) | -0.23 | (0.14) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.04 | (0.02) | c | c | 0.04 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.05 | (0.02) | c | c |
| Lithuania | -0.66 | (0.04) | c | c | -0.66 | (0.04) | c | c | -0.57 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.06) | -0.75 | (0.06) |
| Macao-China | c | c | 0.05 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.00) | -0.11 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | 0.00 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.84 | (0.37) | 0.29 | (0.12) | 0.22 | (0.06) | 0.27 | (0.18) | 0.15 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.13) |
| Montenegro | -0.51 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | -0.50 | (0.00) | c | c | -0.36 | (0.00) | -0.84 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 0.81 | (0.08) | -0.18 | (0.19) | 0.73 | (0.09) | 0.57 | (0.09) | 0.65 | (0.15) | 0.79 | (0.11) | 0.44 | (0.12) |
| Qatar | 0.19 | (0.00) | -0.66 | (0.00) | -0.24 | (0.01) | -0.11 | (0.00) | 0.75 | (0.01) | 0.06 | (0.00) | -0.49 | (0.00) |
| Romania | -0.54 | (0.05) | c | c | -0.54 | (0.05) | c | c | -0.81 | (0.12) | -0.44 | (0.08) | -0.66 | (0.08) |
| Russian Federation | 0.36 | (0.08) | c | c | 0.33 | (0.08) | 0.46 | (0.13) | 0.35 | (0.13) | 0.28 | (0.14) | 0.41 | (0.12) |
| Serbia | -0.74 | (0.05) | c | c | c | c | -0.75 | (0.05) | c | c | -0.66 | (0.08) | -0.86 | (0.07) |
| Shanghai-China | 0.74 | (0.10) | 0.86 | (0.42) | 0.87 | (0.14) | 0.66 | (0.11) | c | c | c | c | 0.75 | (0.09) |
| Singapore | 0.15 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.18 | (0.06) | 0.13 | (0.01) | c | c | c | c | 0.13 | (0.01) |
| Chinese Taipei | -0.19 | (0.12) | -0.01 | (0.15) | 0.10 | (0.16) | -0.29 | (0.09) | c | c | 0.13 | (0.15) | -0.31 | (0.11) |
| Thailand | 0.99 | (0.08) | 0.70 | (0.25) | 1.09 | (0.11) | 0.91 | (0.09) | 1.23 | (0.18) | 0.93 | (0.11) | 0.83 | (0.13) |
| Tunisia | -0.10 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.11 | (0.11) | -0.10 | (0.10) | -0.48 | (0.26) | -0.05 | (0.09) | -0.19 | (0.17) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.49 | (0.11) | -0.31 | (0.10) | 0.20 | (0.16) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.35 | (0.17) | 0.41 | (0.16) | -0.02 | (0.09) |
| Uruguay | 0.49 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.16) | 0.51 | (0.10) | 0.23 | (0.08) | 0.63 | (0.35) | 0.54 | (0.10) | -0.01 | (0.13) |
| Viet Nam | 0.47 | (0.09) | -0.66 | (0.20) | 0.52 | (0.26) | 0.40 | (0.10) | 0.47 | (0.15) | 0.61 | (0.18) | 0.06 | (0.15) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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[Part 1/1]
Teacher professional development
Table IV.3.12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Principal's report on the percentage of mathematics teachers in the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 52.6 | (1.5) |
| 0 | Austria | 53.1 | (2.6) |
|  | Belgium | 36.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Canada | 59.0 | (1.8) |
|  | Chile | 28.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 24.0 | (2.3) |
|  | Denmark | 25.4 | (2.3) |
|  | Estonia | 61.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Finland | 31.7 | (2.4) |
|  | France | 33.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Germany | 23.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Greece | 24.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Hungary | 21.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Iceland | 34.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 88.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Israel | 60.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Italy | 28.4 | (1.3) |
|  | Japan | 21.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Korea | 31.3 | (2.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 47.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 46.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 29.2 | (2.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 61.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Norway | 24.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Poland | 45.9 | (3.6) |
|  | Portugal | 35.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 24.2 | (2.5) |
|  | Slovenia | 58.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Spain | 25.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Sweden | 43.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 23.4 | (1.8) |
|  | Turkey | 18.4 | (2.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 51.7 | (2.8) |
|  | United States | 61.5 | (3.3) |
|  | OECD average | 39.3 | (0.4) |
| \% | Albania | 48.1 | (3.5) |
| E | Argentina | 48.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Brazil | 36.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Bulgaria | 36.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Colombia | 21.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 46.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Croatia | 68.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 33.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 33.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 42.3 | (3.1) |
|  | Jordan | 32.6 | (3.1) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 35.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Latvia | 37.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 35.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Lithuania | 47.7 | (2.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 59.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 42.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Montenegro | 45.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 33.1 | (2.4) |
|  | Qatar | 77.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 45.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 26.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Serbia | 47.8 | (3.9) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 72.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Singapore | 66.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 57.2 | (3.3) |
|  | Thailand | 73.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 39.7 | (3.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 58.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 33.1 | (3.1) |
|  | Viet Nam | 49.6 | (3.7) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 1/2]
Teacher professional development, by school features
Table IV.3.13 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Principal's report on the percentage of mathematics teachers in the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | ```Socio-economically disadvantaged schools \({ }^{1}\)``` |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 53.8 | (1.7) | 51.5 | (1.8) | 52.2 | (1.7) | 52.8 | (1.9) | 50.3 | (3.0) | 54.9 | (2.2) | 49.8 | (3.0) |
| U | Austria | 44.7 | (3.0) | 49.4 | (3.0) | 56.7 | (3.1) | 61.8 | (3.8) | 31.5 | (4.7) | 59.4 | (3.9) | 66.3 | (5.8) |
| O | Belgium | 35.0 | (3.0) | 37.3 | (2.6) | 35.5 | (2.5) | 36.2 | (2.7) | 32.7 | (4.7) | 37.1 | (4.2) | 37.7 | (3.9) |
|  | Canada | 60.4 | (2.2) | 59.5 | (1.8) | 58.1 | (2.1) | 57.5 | (2.0) | 60.4 | (3.3) | 62.5 | (2.5) | 51.1 | (3.4) |
|  | Chile | 25.2 | (3.4) | 23.6 | (2.7) | 25.9 | (3.1) | 37.5 | (4.4) | 26.2 | (3.7) | 13.5 | (4.3) | 39.6 | (5.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 22.7 | (2.6) | 27.9 | (3.1) | 24.8 | (2.7) | 20.7 | (2.4) | 27.9 | (5.4) | 24.3 | (3.1) | 19.1 | (3.5) |
|  | Denmark | 23.0 | (2.7) | 25.2 | (2.4) | 26.9 | (2.7) | 27.4 | (3.5) | 19.9 | (6.2) | 24.4 | (2.5) | 33.4 | (6.9) |
|  | Estonia | 59.8 | (3.0) | 60.9 | (2.7) | 62.6 | (2.4) | 64.0 | (2.6) | 64.7 | (6.0) | 60.0 | (2.9) | 64.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Finland | 31.3 | (2.5) | 30.5 | (2.6) | 31.6 | (2.3) | 33.1 | (2.6) | 23.3 | (5.5) | 34.4 | (3.0) | 28.4 | (4.9) |
|  | France | 35.1 | (3.3) | 33.4 | (3.1) | 34.8 | (2.9) | 31.6 | (3.0) | 36.6 | (5.5) | 31.5 | (3.6) | 35.4 | (4.4) |
|  | Germany | 21.4 | (2.0) | 22.8 | (2.0) | 25.1 | (2.2) | 24.8 | (2.6) | 24.9 | (3.7) | 21.7 | (3.0) | 24.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Greece | 26.8 | (3.9) | 22.6 | (3.2) | 23.1 | (3.0) | 26.7 | (4.0) | 33.3 | (6.0) | 20.1 | (3.7) | 25.4 | (5.0) |
|  | Hungary | 17.6 | (2.5) | 19.8 | (2.3) | 22.4 | (2.7) | 24.3 | (3.1) | 17.8 | (3.1) | 14.8 | (3.9) | 30.5 | (4.3) |
|  | Iceland | 30.9 | (1.1) | 33.5 | (1.2) | 36.1 | (1.3) | 37.6 | (1.3) | 22.2 | (0.5) | 37.6 | (0.3) | 35.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 86.0 | (3.2) | 88.4 | (2.4) | 87.9 | (2.7) | 89.5 | (2.7) | 85.3 | (5.1) | 88.4 | (3.2) | 88.7 | (4.9) |
|  | Israel | 63.4 | (3.1) | 61.1 | (3.0) | 57.4 | (2.9) | 61.8 | (3.1) | 64.8 | (4.7) | 55.0 | (4.7) | 63.4 | (4.1) |
|  | Italy | 26.5 | (1.7) | 28.2 | (1.5) | 28.3 | (1.4) | 31.0 | (1.8) | 27.2 | (3.0) | 27.5 | (2.0) | 30.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Japan | 22.2 | (2.4) | 21.0 | (1.9) | 21.1 | (1.7) | 21.9 | (2.1) | 24.2 | (3.6) | 17.3 | (2.8) | 25.1 | (2.9) |
|  | Korea | 31.3 | (3.9) | 30.6 | (2.9) | 31.3 | (3.0) | 32.0 | (3.3) | 32.5 | (6.2) | 30.8 | (3.6) | 31.3 | (5.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 38.3 | (0.9) | 39.8 | (1.2) | 47.4 | (1.1) | 64.0 | (0.9) | 35.2 | (0.1) | 22.5 | (0.1) | 70.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 40.1 | (1.9) | 45.9 | (1.4) | 48.6 | (1.6) | 51.1 | (1.7) | 39.4 | (2.6) | 45.7 | (2.4) | 55.1 | (2.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 29.7 | (3.6) | 27.4 | (3.1) | 29.4 | (2.9) | 30.7 | (3.0) | 24.9 | (6.4) | 30.0 | (3.4) | 31.4 | (5.0) |
|  | New Zealand | 57.5 | (4.1) | 64.8 | (3.1) | 62.0 | (3.2) | 60.4 | (4.1) | 50.4 | (7.7) | 68.6 | (3.8) | 53.0 | (6.1) |
|  | Norway | 21.2 | (2.1) | 25.0 | (2.5) | 22.5 | (2.3) | 27.5 | (2.8) | 17.3 | (4.3) | 22.7 | (2.6) | 34.0 | (6.0) |
|  | Poland | 48.7 | (4.7) | 49.4 | (4.0) | 42.1 | (3.9) | 43.1 | (3.9) | 57.7 | (7.1) | 44.1 | (4.7) | 35.2 | (7.3) |
|  | Portugal | 38.1 | (4.3) | 34.4 | (3.2) | 33.4 | (2.9) | 35.7 | (3.8) | 38.3 | (6.7) | 32.3 | (4.1) | 38.0 | (7.8) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 19.9 | (2.7) | 26.2 | (3.3) | 24.8 | (2.7) | 25.6 | (2.9) | 18.7 | (4.6) | 24.5 | (3.5) | 30.0 | (5.1) |
|  | Slovenia | 56.8 | (1.2) | 56.3 | (1.4) | 58.4 | (1.6) | 61.4 | (1.2) | 58.2 | (0.9) | 50.3 | (1.2) | 68.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Spain | 25.4 | (1.8) | 24.6 | (1.7) | 24.8 | (1.7) | 26.5 | (2.7) | 27.2 | (3.1) | 22.3 | (2.1) | 28.0 | (4.2) |
|  | Sweden | 42.2 | (3.6) | 45.6 | (3.5) | 45.8 | (3.8) | 41.8 | (4.1) | 45.5 | (7.2) | 43.6 | (4.1) | 43.2 | (7.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 24.8 | (2.4) | 22.8 | (1.9) | 22.8 | (2.1) | 23.3 | (2.0) | 24.9 | (4.1) | 21.4 | (2.6) | 25.4 | (3.6) |
|  | Turkey | 12.2 | (2.6) | 14.8 | (2.2) | 17.9 | (2.7) | 28.9 | (4.3) | 8.3 | (3.3) | 12.2 | (3.5) | 41.4 | (7.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 53.8 | (3.4) | 52.7 | (3.4) | 50.8 | (2.9) | 48.9 | (3.1) | 56.4 | (6.4) | 52.2 | (3.7) | 46.0 | (5.1) |
|  | United States | 63.4 | (3.8) | 63.8 | (3.6) | 59.9 | (3.9) | 58.6 | (4.0) | 63.2 | (6.8) | 64.3 | (5.3) | 55.6 | (6.6) |
|  | OECD average | 37.9 | (0.5) | 38.8 | (0.5) | 39.2 | (0.4) | 41.2 | (0.5) | 37.4 | (0.8) | 37.4 | (0.6) | 42.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{3}$ | Argentina | 44.6 | (3.6) | 46.8 | (3.0) | 48.0 | (3.6) | 53.9 | (4.4) | 46.6 | (4.3) | 40.1 | (4.8) | 58.4 | (6.8) |
| ๕ | Brazil | 38.0 | (2.9) | 33.5 | (2.3) | 35.8 | (2.4) | 38.1 | (2.7) | 38.2 | (4.0) | 33.4 | (3.0) | 38.7 | (3.9) |
|  | Bulgaria | 33.6 | (3.1) | 34.8 | (2.9) | 35.2 | (2.8) | 41.9 | (4.1) | 34.1 | (4.7) | 31.3 | (5.3) | 43.0 | (4.6) |
|  | Colombia | 18.8 | (3.3) | 19.8 | (2.0) | 23.7 | (2.4) | 25.4 | (2.7) | 13.0 | (3.4) | 23.8 | (4.5) | 27.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Costa Rica | 42.6 | (3.6) | 47.6 | (3.8) | 46.3 | (3.3) | 47.7 | (4.9) | 38.3 | (5.0) | 49.7 | (4.4) | 48.4 | (6.8) |
|  | Croatia | 71.5 | (2.9) | 68.6 | (3.0) | 67.1 | (2.9) | 66.9 | (3.1) | 69.5 | (4.4) | 70.3 | (4.3) | 63.6 | (5.8) |
|  | Cyprus* | 40.7 | (1.1) | 34.2 | (1.2) | 31.8 | (1.2) | 24.6 | (0.9) | 43.5 | (0.2) | 33.0 | (0.2) | 19.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 31.2 | (3.2) | 30.7 | (2.9) | 33.9 | (3.1) | 39.0 | (6.4) | 30.9 | (4.4) | 31.0 | (4.1) | 41.7 | (7.5) |
|  | Indonesia | 38.6 | (3.7) | 41.6 | (3.6) | 39.3 | (3.2) | 49.6 | (4.7) | 39.4 | (4.5) | 39.9 | (6.2) | 49.6 | (5.4) |
|  | Jordan | 31.9 | (3.6) | 33.1 | (3.3) | 31.9 | (3.1) | 34.2 | (5.0) | 31.6 | (6.5) | 30.9 | (4.1) | 38.6 | (7.9) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 32.7 | (3.0) | 36.6 | (3.4) | 36.5 | (3.2) | 37.5 | (3.5) | 23.3 | (4.4) | 40.6 | (4.0) | 38.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Latvia | 35.9 | (3.4) | 38.8 | (3.4) | 36.9 | (3.3) | 37.8 | (3.5) | 24.0 | (5.3) | 45.3 | (4.3) | 33.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 23.3 | (4.0) | 35.6 | (4.2) | 41.2 | (4.1) | 43.4 | (3.6) | c | c | 23.0 | (1.1) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 45.7 | (3.3) | 46.5 | (3.1) | 49.5 | (2.8) | 49.3 | (3.7) | 42.4 | (5.3) | 47.0 | (3.9) | 54.4 | (5.6) |
|  | Macao-China | 60.6 | (1.0) | 61.2 | (1.2) | 60.5 | (1.2) | 54.0 | (1.0) | 68.8 | (0.1) | 31.3 | (0.1) | 58.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 40.5 | (3.4) | 41.9 | (3.4) | 41.8 | (3.7) | 45.6 | (3.9) | 35.4 | (4.8) | 44.9 | (5.0) | 45.7 | (5.7) |
|  | Montenegro | 43.9 | (1.0) | 42.6 | (1.0) | 44.1 | (1.1) | 52.5 | (0.9) | 42.8 | (0.2) | 33.3 | (0.2) | 56.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 24.5 | (2.9) | 29.8 | (2.7) | 36.6 | (2.7) | 41.7 | (4.2) | 23.9 | (3.9) | 31.2 | (3.9) | 44.4 | (4.8) |
|  | Qatar | 81.0 | (0.5) | 75.9 | (0.6) | 74.1 | (0.6) | 77.5 | (0.6) | 77.1 | (0.1) | 84.2 | (0.1) | 73.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 42.2 | (4.2) | 45.9 | (3.7) | 45.1 | (3.6) | 46.9 | (4.0) | 39.4 | (6.1) | 48.9 | (4.8) | 45.4 | (5.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 22.8 | (2.5) | 25.6 | (2.7) | 25.1 | (2.8) | 30.3 | (4.2) | 19.8 | (2.9) | 25.0 | (3.5) | 32.7 | (5.3) |
|  | Serbia | 40.3 | (4.3) | 46.0 | (4.3) | 49.7 | (4.2) | 55.0 | (4.3) | 26.5 | (5.5) | 58.9 | (5.9) | 57.2 | (6.8) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 66.5 | (3.9) | 69.3 | (3.0) | 74.4 | (2.9) | 78.9 | (3.1) | 55.7 | (5.7) | 77.2 | (4.1) | 81.0 | (4.4) |
|  | Singapore | 65.2 | (1.0) | 66.5 | (1.1) | 66.2 | (1.0) | 68.8 | (1.4) | 62.2 | (0.2) | 68.7 | (0.5) | 68.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 49.3 | (3.6) | 55.2 | (3.7) | 59.8 | (3.6) | 64.5 | (4.2) | 43.9 | (5.2) | 58.3 | (5.5) | 70.1 | (5.8) |
|  | Thailand | 77.0 | (3.3) | 70.5 | (3.5) | 70.7 | (3.3) | 74.9 | (2.7) | 77.1 | (4.5) | 66.1 | (5.5) | 76.1 | (3.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 37.6 | (4.7) | 38.9 | (3.9) | 40.3 | (3.7) | 42.2 | (5.2) | 38.6 | (7.2) | 35.8 | (5.1) | 47.9 | (7.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 64.2 | (2.7) | 58.1 | (1.9) | 54.5 | (1.8) | 55.2 | (2.3) | 70.8 | (4.1) | 56.1 | (2.8) | 51.1 | (3.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 34.3 | (4.2) | 34.9 | (3.6) | 34.1 | (3.3) | 29.5 | (3.9) | 35.1 | (5.2) | 32.3 | (4.5) | 30.8 | (5.9) |
|  | Viet Nam | 53.2 | (4.7) | 51.2 | (4.2) | 49.8 | (4.3) | 44.4 | (5.6) | 52.3 | (5.9) | 49.5 | (6.3) | 45.8 | (7.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3),
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Teacher professional development, by school features
Table IV.3.13 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Principal's report on the percentage of mathematics teachers in the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town (3 000 to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 53.6 | (2.0) | 50.7 | (2.2) | 52.3 | (1.6) | 53.4 | (2.3) | 42.1 | (6.3) | 53.4 | (2.9) | 53.7 | (1.9) |
| U | Austria | 53.5 | (2.8) | 49.7 | (10.7) | 46.6 | (5.2) | 53.5 | (2.8) | 50.0 | (10.7) | 53.2 | (3.8) | 53.8 | (5.2) |
|  | Belgium | 32.0 | (4.2) | 40.1 | (2.8) | 39.8 | (4.7) | 35.6 | (2.3) | 31.9 | (17.3) | 38.5 | (2.9) | 28.0 | (4.8) |
|  | Canada | 60.7 | (1.9) | 40.4 | (6.4) | 56.6 | (2.7) | 59.4 | (1.9) | 55.4 | (6.0) | 60.0 | (3.1) | 58.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Chile | 26.2 | (3.5) | 28.7 | (3.7) | 19.7 | (4.2) | 28.5 | (2.7) | 47.5 | (15.4) | 29.6 | (3.8) | 26.4 | (3.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 23.8 | (2.3) | 26.5 | (9.7) | 22.7 | (2.8) | 25.6 | (3.6) | 29.5 | (7.4) | 22.9 | (2.7) | 25.3 | (4.9) |
|  | Denmark | 26.3 | (2.9) | 23.7 | (4.8) | 25.5 | (2.3) | c |  | 13.0 | (3.4) | 31.8 | (3.3) | 22.4 | (4.8) |
|  | Estonia | 62.0 | (2.2) | 41.1 | (17.5) | 61.9 | (2.2) | 57.8 | (8.5) | 54.8 | (4.9) | 61.2 | (3.3) | 68.6 | (4.2) |
|  | Finland | 32.0 | (2.4) | 23.7 | (0.9) | 31.6 | (2.4) | c | c | 26.8 | (10.2) | 30.9 | (2.9) | 34.8 | (3.7) |
|  | France | 37.1 | (3.1) | 22.7 | (4.0) | 31.2 | (3.8) | 35.0 | (3.2) | 43.8 | (12.5) | 30.6 | (3.0) | 39.7 | (5.7) |
|  | Germany | 24.3 | (1.9) | 10.8 | (4.1) | 23.4 | (1.8) | 19.8 | (10.7) | c | c | 23.6 | (2.3) | 22.0 | (3.7) |
|  | Greece | 24.2 | (3.0) | c | c | 18.8 | (5.9) | 25.1 | (3.0) | 34.1 | (9.5) | 24.2 | (3.6) | 23.7 | (4.9) |
|  | Hungary | 20.9 | (2.3) | 22.1 | (7.2) | 20.7 | (6.2) | 21.1 | (2.3) | 4.5 | (3.5) | 20.9 | (3.1) | 22.5 | (4.0) |
|  | Iceland | 34.6 | (0.2) | c | c | 34.4 | (0.2) | c | c | 17.5 | (0.5) | 43.8 | (0.3) | 30.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 90.4 | (3.3) | 85.3 | (3.5) | 88.4 | (2.3) | 87.3 | (2.6) | 88.1 | (5.6) | 84.9 | (3.7) | 92.8 | (2.7) |
|  | Israel | 60.7 | (2.6) | c | c | 68.1 | (4.3) | 59.5 | (2.6) | 51.5 | (5.9) | 62.8 | (3.7) | 62.0 | (5.0) |
|  | Italy | 28.1 | (1.3) | 32.0 | (9.4) | 18.3 | (3.5) | 28.7 | (1.4) | 18.6 | (10.3) | 28.4 | (1.5) | 29.2 | (2.8) |
|  | Japan | 20.7 | (2.0) | 23.5 | (3.5) | C | c | 21.5 | (1.8) | c | c | 25.0 | (4.0) | 20.2 | (2.1) |
|  | Korea | 35.0 | (4.1) | 26.8 | (4.0) | 47.5 | (11.7) | 30.3 | (3.0) | c | c | 37.8 | (10.7) | 30.4 | (3.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 45.5 | (0.1) | 58.6 | (0.2) | 43.4 | (0.1) | 53.1 | (0.1) | C | C | 47.3 | (0.1) | c | C |
|  | Mexico | 46.3 | (1.3) | 47.0 | (4.0) | 49.5 | (2.3) | 44.9 | (1.7) | 34.2 | (3.7) | 47.0 | (2.5) | 50.5 | (2.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 35.2 | (6.0) | 26.2 | (2.8) | 27.6 | (3.2) | 32.8 | (3.8) | c | c | 30.1 | (3.5) | 26.9 | (4.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 61.1 | (3.0) | 55.7 | (15.6) | 55.5 | (3.5) | 61.6 | (3.0) | 53.0 | (10.9) | 64.8 | (4.9) | 59.7 | (4.1) |
|  | Norway | 24.4 | (2.2) | c | c | 24.1 | (2.2) | c | c | 12.4 | (2.2) | 25.3 | (3.0) | 31.8 | (5.4) |
|  | Poland | 46.1 | (3.7) | 39.8 | (10.3) | 45.9 | (3.6) | c | c | 45.4 | (6.9) | 47.9 | (5.1) | 42.0 | (6.9) |
|  | Portugal | 35.1 | (3.0) | 38.3 | (8.1) | 35.6 | (3.9) | 35.2 | (3.3) | 59.9 | (20.2) | 34.0 | (3.9) | 32.7 | (6.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 24.3 | (2.6) | 24.1 | (7.3) | 19.1 | (3.0) | 28.6 | (4.0) | 12.1 | (3.4) | 25.2 | (3.1) | 31.6 | (6.2) |
|  | Slovenia | 58.3 | (0.6) | 54.9 | (2.1) | 52.7 | (9.7) | 58.5 | (0.3) | 25.7 | (16.4) | 58.2 | (0.5) | 59.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Spain | 26.5 | (1.6) | 22.3 | (3.2) | 25.3 | (1.6) | c | c | 34.6 | (6.2) | 28.5 | (2.1) | 19.7 | (2.8) |
|  | Sweden | 45.2 | (3.5) | 35.6 | (7.1) | 43.7 | (3.4) | 52.6 | (11.7) | 47.5 | (7.4) | 44.3 | (4.5) | 40.4 | (6.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 24.3 | (1.9) | 10.3 | (3.4) | 24.4 | (1.9) | 19.9 | (3.9) | 22.8 | (4.9) | 22.9 | (2.3) | 26.0 | (4.8) |
|  | Turkey | 17.3 | (2.2) | c | c | 14.6 | (9.0) | 18.5 | (2.4) | 8.9 | (5.2) | 18.9 | (4.6) | 18.5 | (3.8) |
|  | United Kingdom | 50.3 | (3.4) | 53.6 | (5.2) | c | c | 51.7 | (2.8) | 40.0 | (8.1) | 52.5 | (4.1) | 53.2 | (5.5) |
|  | United States | 62.0 | (3.5) | 55.4 | (13.8) | 63.5 | (7.1) | 61.2 | (3.2) | 48.0 | (15.7) | 62.5 | (4.5) | 63.9 | (5.0) |
|  | OECD average | 39.6 | (0.5) | 36.9 | (1.3) | 38.5 | (0.8) | 41.5 | (0.8) | 36.3 | (1.7) | 40.4 | (0.6) | 39.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Albania | 47.2 | (3.8) | 49.6 | (12.8) | 45.4 | (5.1) | 50.0 | (4.4) | 40.9 | (8.1) | 41.1 | (5.1) | 63.0 | (6.8) |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 48.4 | (3.5) | 48.0 | (6.1) | 43.7 | (3.4) | 51.0 | (3.4) | 33.4 | (8.5) | 50.5 | (4.7) | 49.0 | (3.8) |
| む | Brazil | 34.9 | (2.3) | 43.3 | (7.2) | 46.5 | (3.2) | 33.7 | (2.4) | 23.7 | (11.2) | 38.8 | (3.2) | 34.1 | (3.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 35.8 | (2.5) | c | c | 29.1 | (4.1) | 36.6 | (2.6) | 19.3 | (13.7) | 39.0 | (3.2) | 33.4 | (4.6) |
|  | Colombia | 21.5 | (2.4) | 23.8 | (4.5) | 22.2 | (2.6) | 21.7 | (2.1) | 15.7 | (5.9) | 21.9 | (5.7) | 23.2 | (2.4) |
|  | Costa Rica | 46.2 | (3.2) | 49.7 | (8.8) | 44.6 | (2.9) | 48.3 | (4.2) | 50.0 | (6.2) | 44.9 | (3.7) | 44.4 | (6.6) |
|  | Croatia | 69.2 | (2.7) | c | c | c | c | 68.5 | (2.6) | c | c | 70.5 | (3.2) | 65.8 | (4.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 35.4 | (0.1) | 20.0 | (0.2) | 53.7 | (1.0) | 31.9 | (0.1) | 35.0 | (0.5) | 39.3 | (0.1) | 21.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 29.1 | (9.1) | 33.0 | (3.0) | 32.2 | (2.8) | 34.3 | (3.2) | c | c | c | c | 33.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 46.9 | (3.5) | 36.8 | (5.2) | 43.8 | (4.5) | 40.7 | (4.3) | 40.1 | (6.4) | 40.6 | (4.0) | 49.5 | (5.5) |
|  | Jordan | 30.3 | (3.1) | 43.3 | (10.9) | 32.6 | (3.1) | c | c | 28.2 | (7.8) | 30.2 | (4.7) | 36.4 | (5.0) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 36.3 | (2.9) | 19.1 | (12.7) | 36.3 | (3.1) | 34.5 | (4.3) | 30.4 | (4.4) | 43.3 | (6.8) | 35.8 | (4.0) |
|  | Latvia | 37.9 | (2.9) | c | c | 37.3 | (2.8) | 40.7 | (7.1) | 34.5 | (4.2) | 39.1 | (4.8) | 37.5 | (4.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 36.5 | (0.7) | c | c | 31.0 | (0.7) | 70.0 | (0.0) | , | c | 35.6 | (0.7) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 48.0 | (2.8) | c | c | 47.7 | (2.8) | c | c | 37.1 | (4.5) | 47.5 | (4.7) | 53.7 | (4.2) |
|  | Macao-China | c | c | 61.1 | (0.0) | 61.4 | (0.1) | 56.0 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | 59.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 43.3 | (3.3) | 27.6 | (14.9) | 39.4 | (5.9) | 42.6 | (3.1) | 35.8 | (6.7) | 44.4 | (4.2) | 41.4 | (5.8) |
|  | Montenegro | 45.4 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | 45.7 | (0.1) | c | c | 47.4 | (0.2) | 41.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 28.7 | (2.7) | 39.1 | (5.9) | 28.7 | (2.9) | 34.9 | (2.7) | 23.5 | (6.0) | 28.6 | (3.1) | 41.6 | (4.4) |
|  | Qatar | 91.7 | (0.0) | 52.2 | (0.1) | 68.4 | (0.2) | 79.1 | (0.1) | 88.5 | (0.1) | 80.4 | (0.1) | 72.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 44.6 | (3.2) | c | C | 45.0 | (3.2) | c | c | 35.0 | (10.6) | 43.9 | (4.0) | 49.2 | (5.6) |
|  | Russian Federation | 25.7 | (2.6) | c | c | 26.9 | (2.8) | 21.8 | (3.5) | 22.3 | (2.9) | 25.2 | (4.7) | 28.3 | (3.9) |
|  | Serbia | 48.0 | (3.9) | c | c | c | c | 47.9 | (3.8) | c | c | 37.1 | (5.2) | 63.6 | (5.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 70.7 | (2.9) | 86.9 | (6.0) | 74.5 | (4.5) | 70.5 | (3.3) | c | c | c | c | 72.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Singapore | 66.3 | (0.1) | c | c | 64.3 | (2.5) | 66.7 | (0.4) | c | c | c | c | 66.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 61.1 | (4.5) | 50.8 | (5.2) | 66.3 | (6.3) | 51.9 | (3.5) | c | C | 53.6 | (6.1) | 58.9 | (4.2) |
|  | Thailand | 76.2 | (2.7) | 56.6 | (9.5) | 74.5 | (3.6) | 72.9 | (3.0) | 80.5 | (5.5) | 74.0 | (3.9) | 68.6 | (5.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 40.0 | (3.5) | C | C | 33.6 | (5.7) | 43.3 | (4.4) | 56.4 | (22.6) | 35.7 | (3.6) | 50.0 | (9.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 74.5 | (2.6) | 46.8 | (3.2) | 53.9 | (4.8) | 58.7 | (1.7) | 50.1 | (6.6) | 60.9 | (4.2) | 57.4 | (2.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 34.8 | (3.6) | 25.0 | (6.0) | 33.7 | (4.4) | 32.6 | (3.4) | 49.5 | (14.8) | 32.5 | (4.0) | 30.8 | (4.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | 51.0 | (3.9) | 27.9 | (19.2) | 70.4 | (10.8) | 47.2 | (4.0) | 54.5 | (5.7) | 51.1 | (6.3) | 39.4 | (8.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV.3.14 Results based on school principals' reports


| Albania | -0.42 | (0.07) | -1.64 | (0.09) | -0.75 | (0.08) | -0.19 | (0.09) | 0.91 | (0.12) | 1.00 | (0.04) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | -0.38 | (0.10) | -2.04 | (0.16) | -0.77 | (0.11) | 0.03 | (0.16) | 1.27 | (0.07) | 1.25 | (0.06) |
| ๕ Brazil | -0.35 | (0.05) | -1.84 | (0.08) | -0.77 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.08) | 1.15 | (0.06) | 1.16 | (0.03) |
| Bulgaria | 0.19 | (0.06) | -1.02 | (0.10) | -0.09 | (0.07) | 0.57 | (0.13) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Colombia | -0.78 | (0.09) | -2.24 | (0.14) | -1.12 | (0.11) | -0.41 | (0.08) | 0.67 | (0.12) | 1.13 | (0.05) |
| Costa Rica | -0.71 | (0.07) | -2.25 | (0.12) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.34 | (0.06) | 0.73 | (0.13) | 1.15 | (0.05) |
| Croatia | -0.57 | (0.07) | -1.72 | (0.09) | -0.90 | (0.10) | -0.18 | (0.08) | 0.52 | (0.07) | 0.89 | (0.04) |
| Cyprus* | -0.02 | (0.00) | -1.12 | (0.00) | -0.29 | (0.00) | 0.22 | (0.00) | 1.09 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | -0.02 | (0.07) | -1.08 | (0.11) | -0.30 | (0.05) | 0.13 | (0.10) | 1.14 | (0.10) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| Indonesia | -0.52 | (0.08) | -1.57 | (0.13) | -0.72 | (0.10) | -0.32 | (0.05) | 0.52 | (0.14) | 0.85 | (0.06) |
| Jordan | -0.56 | (0.09) | -2.08 | (0.13) | -0.97 | (0.11) | -0.18 | (0.11) | 0.98 | (0.12) | 1.18 | (0.05) |
| Kazakhstan | -0.21 | (0.09) | -1.70 | (0.14) | -0.66 | (0.12) | 0.23 | (0.18) | 1.31 | (0.04) | 1.17 | (0.06) |
| Latvia | 0.38 | (0.06) | -0.61 | (0.09) | 0.12 | (0.10) | 0.70 | (0.10) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.77 | (0.04) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.11 | (0.02) | C | c | C | c | C | c | c | C | 0.79 | (0.01) |
| Lithuania | -0.01 | (0.06) | -1.16 | (0.12) | -0.28 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.15 | (0.08) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| Macao-China | -0.11 | (0.00) | -1.36 | (0.00) | -0.46 | (0.00) | 0.11 | (0.00) | 1.27 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.08 | (0.08) | -1.31 | (0.11) | -0.29 | (0.11) | 0.60 | (0.16) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.04 | (0.05) |
| Montenegro | -0.07 | (0.00) | -1.03 | (0.00) | -0.42 | (0.00) | 0.12 | (0.00) | 1.05 | (0.00) | 0.82 | (0.00) |
| Peru | -0.47 | (0.08) | -1.94 | (0.10) | -0.85 | (0.10) | -0.14 | (0.09) | 1.06 | (0.11) | 1.15 | (0.05) |
| Qatar | 0.46 | (0.00) | -0.91 | (0.00) | 0.14 | (0.01) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.98 | (0.00) |
| Romania | 0.18 | (0.05) | -0.65 | (0.08) | -0.11 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.06) | 1.15 | (0.09) | 0.71 | (0.03) |
| Russian Federation | 0.17 | (0.07) | -1.07 | (0.12) | -0.13 | (0.08) | 0.56 | (0.15) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.05) |
| Serbia | -0.34 | (0.09) | -1.47 | (0.12) | -0.65 | (0.09) | -0.16 | (0.10) | 0.90 | (0.14) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| Shanghai-China | -0.19 | (0.09) | -1.67 | (0.11) | -0.53 | (0.10) | 0.18 | (0.14) | 1.28 | (0.08) | 1.13 | (0.04) |
| Singapore | 0.40 | (0.01) | -0.65 | (0.01) | 0.08 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.80 | (0.00) |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.05 | (0.08) | -1.34 | (0.14) | -0.29 | (0.11) | 0.53 | (0.17) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.04 | (0.06) |
| Thailand | -0.87 | (0.08) | -2.34 | (0.12) | -1.23 | (0.09) | -0.49 | (0.10) | 0.56 | (0.12) | 1.13 | (0.05) |
| Tunisia | -1.25 | (0.08) | -2.35 | (0.09) | -1.53 | (0.07) | -1.08 | (0.11) | -0.04 | (0.15) | 0.93 | (0.06) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.14 | (0.05) | -1.53 | (0.10) | -0.15 | (0.09) | 0.91 | (0.08) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.18 | (0.04) |
| Uruguay | -0.41 | (0.09) | -2.04 | (0.16) | -0.81 | (0.10) | 0.08 | (0.12) | 1.15 | (0.08) | 1.24 | (0.05) |
| Viet Nam | -0.40 | (0.09) | -1.70 | (0.15) | -0.64 | (0.08) | -0.11 | (0.11) | 0.84 | (0.12) | 1.01 | (0.06) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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|  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared $x$ 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 494 | (4.6) | 498 | (4.7) | 511 | (3.7) | 517 | (3.5) | 9.4 | (2.60) | 1.2 | (0.08) | 0.8 | (0.47) |
| U Austria | 517 | (9.7) | 491 | (10.9) | 511 | (8.7) | 509 | (9.5) | 1.5 | (5.15) | 0.9 | (0.20) | 0.0 | (0.33) |
| Belgium | 505 | (8.5) | 513 | (9.1) | 514 | (9.1) | 530 | (7.9) | 8.3 | (5.30) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.6 | (0.80) |
| Canada | 520 | (4.5) | 515 | (3.8) | 518 | (3.5) | 519 | (3.3) | 0.4 | (2.37) | 0.9 | (0.07) | 0.0 | (0.06) |
| Chile | 394 | (5.1) | 415 | (7.1) | 430 | (6.8) | 451 | (8.3) | 17.7 | (3.01) | 1.7 | (0.20) | 5.8 | (1.78) |
| Czech Republic | 507 | (9.0) | 492 | (7.4) | 500 | (7.6) | 496 | (8.2) | -6.1 | (5.88) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.3 | (0.44) |
| Denmark | 497 | (5.8) | 499 | (4.8) | 506 | (5.8) | 502 | (5.4) | 1.5 | (3.37) | 1.1 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.15) |
| Estonia | 527 | (4.2) | 524 | (5.1) | 513 | (4.9) | 522 | (4.0) | -4.1 | (1.92) | 0.9 | (0.09) | 0.3 | (0.25) |
| Finland | 517 | (4.1) | 518 | (4.2) | 520 | (4.4) | 520 | (4.0) | 0.5 | (2.06) | 1.0 | (0.08) | 0.0 | (0.05) |
| France | 516 | (9.2) | 488 | (9.7) | 482 | (9.2) | 500 | (8.3) | -7.4 | (5.97) | 0.7 | (0.15) | 0.5 | (0.82) |
| Germany | 518 | (7.6) | 515 | (9.8) | 512 | (8.2) | 510 | (9.6) | -3.9 | (5.11) | 0.8 | (0.13) | 0.1 | (0.43) |
| Greece | 440 | (7.3) | 456 | (5.9) | 464 | (6.2) | 453 | (8.1) | 4.9 | (3.38) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 0.4 | (0.50) |
| Hungary | 472 | (10.3) | 474 | (10.3) | 497 | (13.7) | 469 | (10.6) | 0.7 | (6.69) | 1.1 | (0.22) | 0.0 | (0.28) |
| Iceland | 500 | (3.1) | 490 | (4.0) | 487 | (3.4) | 493 | (4.9) | -3.1 | (2.14) | 0.8 | (0.06) | 0.1 | (0.11) |
| Ireland | 502 | (5.0) | 502 | (6.9) | 499 | (7.4) | 507 | (6.6) | 0.1 | (2.69) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.10) |
| Israel | 448 | (11.8) | 482 | (11.9) | 467 | (11.3) | 477 | (11.8) | 5.6 | (6.44) | 1.3 | (0.25) | 0.3 | (0.75) |
| Italy | 481 | (5.1) | 489 | (5.3) | 483 | (5.5) | 496 | (5.1) | 5.4 | (2.57) | 1.1 | (0.11) | 0.4 | (0.35) |
| Japan | 538 | (9.7) | 532 | (10.2) | 526 | (8.2) | 549 | (7.5) | 4.7 | (4.95) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 0.2 | (0.53) |
| Korea | 557 | (9.1) | 554 | (9.3) | 550 | (9.1) | 555 | (9.9) | -1.9 | (5.21) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.28) |
| Luxembourg | 502 | (2.5) | 477 | (2.1) | 471 | (2.9) | 510 | (2.6) | 3.4 | (1.10) | 0.8 | (0.04) | 0.1 | (0.06) |
| Mexico | 394 | (2.87) | 407 | (2.86) | 421 | (2.55) | 432 | (3.8) | 13.6 | (1.84) | 1.6 | (0.10) | 3.8 | (0.98) |
| Netherlands | 528 | (12.3) | 512 | (12.8) | 512 | (10.1) | 526 | (12.9) | 2.3 | (6.83) | 0.9 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.56) |
| New Zealand | 502 | (7.7) | 508 | (6.0) | 495 | (8.6) | 503 | (7.9) | -1.6 | (4.22) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.19) |
| Norway | 493 | (6.2) | 491 | (5.3) | 486 | (6.4) | 496 | (5.5) | 0.3 | (2.79) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.08) |
| Poland | 525 | (8.8) | 519 | (6.4) | 512 | (4.8) | 513 | (5.9) | -8.4 | (4.69) | 0.9 | (0.11) | 0.6 | (0.66) |
| Portugal | 462 | (7.7) | 489 | (7.7) | 484 | (9.7) | 512 | (6.9) | 19.2 | (4.19) | 1.6 | (0.21) | 3.4 | (1.48) |
| Slovak Republic | 479 | (8.4) | 483 | (9.3) | 488 | (10.3) | 477 | (10.8) | -1.5 | (5.29) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.24) |
| Slovenia | 512 | (3.7) | 507 | (4.1) | 505 | (3.1) | 496 | (2.4) | -2.9 | (1.40) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.1 | (0.09) |
| Spain | 474 | (3.6) | 480 | (4.6) | 489 | (4.0) | 495 | (4.4) | 7.8 | (2.06) | 1.2 | (0.09) | 0.8 | (0.41) |
| Sweden | 472 | (6.3) | 479 | (5.1) | 477 | (5.1) | 484 | (5.8) | 4.2 | (3.33) | 1.1 | (0.14) | 0.2 | (0.35) |
| Switzerland | 535 | (7.4) | 523 | (8.6) | 536 | (7.7) | 534 | (5.2) | 0.4 | (3.64) | 0.9 | (0.11) | 0.0 | (0.11) |
| Turkey | 414 | (7.4) | 442 | (9.3) | 457 | (9.9) | 479 | (13.7) | 22.3 | (5.83) | 1.6 | (0.20) | 5.7 | (2.76) |
| United Kingdom | 497 | (5.7) | 501 | (5.6) | 502 | (8.0) | 481 | (10.0) | -4.7 | (4.24) | 0.9 | (0.12) | 0.3 | (0.57) |
| United States | 467 | (7.1) | 486 | (5.9) | 485 | (6.8) | 491 | (6.9) | 11.4 | (4.62) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 1.0 | (0.87) |
| OECD average | 491 | (1.2) | 493 | (1.3) | 494 | (1.3) | 500 | (1.3) | 2.9 | (0.72) | 1.1 | (0.03) | 0.8 | (0.13) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 394 | (4.4) | 391 | (4.7) | 395 | (4.6) | 396 | (4.6) | 1.7 | (2.15) | 1.0 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (0.11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | Argentina | 355 | (7.5) | 393 | (7.4) | 393 | (7.0) | 412 | (8.3) | 16.6 | (3.02) | 2.0 | (0.27) | 7.4 | (2.63) |
| ส | Brazil | 369 | (3.6) | 381 | (3.2) | 396 | (6.5) | 419 | (4.9) | 16.4 | (2.09) | 1.4 | (0.11) | 6.0 | (1.38) |
|  | Bulgaria | 464 | (9.2) | 428 | (9.2) | 438 | (8.2) | 425 | (9.1) | -14.6 | (5.80) | 0.7 | (0.12) | 2.0 | (1.59) |
|  | Colombia | 363 | (7.0) | 372 | (5.8) | 379 | (5.6) | 392 | (6.5) | 11.0 | (2.84) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 2.8 | (1.44) |
|  | Costa Rica | 385 | (6.8) | 398 | (6.1) | 413 | (6.5) | 433 | (7.5) | 16.7 | (3.51) | 1.7 | (0.23) | 7.8 | (3.13) |
|  | Croatia | 472 | (8.2) | 470 | (8.9) | 465 | (9.1) | 477 | (9.1) | 0.5 | (4.81) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.16) |
|  | Cyprus* | 442 | (2.5) | 453 | (2.7) | 447 | (2.9) | 424 | (2.6) | -6.8 | (1.24) | 1.0 | (0.07) | 0.4 | (0.15) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 570 | (8.6) | 549 | (10.4) | 557 | (7.9) | 569 | (9.1) | 0.8 | (5.81) | 0.8 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.25) |
|  | Indonesia | 358 | (6.8) | 366 | (6.7) | 378 | (7.2) | 398 | (10.0) | 21.4 | (5.91) | 1.3 | (0.20) | 6.4 | (3.34) |
|  | Jordan | 380 | (7.4) | 383 | (6.3) | 383 | (8.0) | 397 | (7.2) | 4.6 | (3.09) | 1.1 | (0.16) | 0.5 | (0.64) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 437 | (6.5) | 432 | (7.9) | 425 | (5.5) | 435 | (7.1) | -0.3 | (2.99) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.22) |
|  | Latvia | 487 | (7.8) | 491 | (5.7) | 493 | (5.1) | 489 | (5.9) | -1.1 | (5.10) | 1.1 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.23) |
|  | Liechtenstein | C | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | -51.6 | (5.06) | 0.5 | (0.23) | 19.4 | (3.23) |
|  | Lithuania | 491 | (6.5) | 481 | (6.4) | 475 | (5.6) | 469 | (6.8) | -8.6 | (3.83) | 0.8 | (0.12) | 0.8 | (0.71) |
|  | Macao-China | 533 | (2.4) | 548 | (2.0) | 521 | (2.4) | 550 | (1.9) | 6.8 | (0.98) | 1.1 | (0.05) | 0.5 | (0.15) |
|  | Malaysia | 415 | (6.5) | 426 | (7.5) | 425 | (8.0) | 416 | (7.0) | 0.0 | (3.22) | 1.1 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.15) |
|  | Montenegro | 401 | (2.5) | 429 | (3.4) | 401 | (2.7) | 408 | (2.4) | 2.0 | (1.16) | 1.2 | (0.07) | 0.0 | (0.05) |
|  | Peru | 341 | (6.3) | 353 | (6.4) | 374 | (9.0) | 403 | (9.6) | 18.6 | (3.74) | 1.6 | (0.22) | 6.4 | (2.31) |
|  | Qatar | 387 | (1.5) | 389 | (1.5) | 365 | (2.0) | 365 | (1.8) | -10.3 | (0.83) | 0.9 | (0.04) | 1.0 | (0.16) |
|  | Romania | 443 | (7.6) | 440 | (7.2) | 448 | (8.4) | 448 | (7.5) | 4.5 | (5.17) | 1.0 | (0.15) | 0.2 | (0.43) |
|  | Russian Federation | 484 | (5.6) | 489 | (5.3) | 474 | (5.5) | 481 | (7.5) | -2.6 | (3.66) | 1.0 | (0.09) | 0.1 | (0.26) |
|  | Serbia | 442 | (9.0) | 449 | (8.9) | 457 | (10.2) | 446 | (9.3) | 1.0 | (5.30) | 1.1 | (0.20) | 0.0 | (0.32) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 606 | (9.1) | 612 | (9.4) | 604 | (10.1) | 629 | (11.3) | 7.2 | (5.19) | 1.0 | (0.18) | 0.7 | (1.04) |
|  | Singapore | 570 | (2.6) | 566 | (3.0) | 577 | (3.6) | 581 | (4.2) | 7.5 | (1.80) | 1.0 | (0.06) | 0.3 | (0.17) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 556 | (11.2) | 552 | (11.8) | 574 | (10.4) | 554 | (9.5) | 2.5 | (5.81) | 1.1 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.36) |
|  | Thailand | 422 | (7.8) | 430 | (8.0) | 434 | (7.3) | 421 | (6.5) | -0.4 | (3.42) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.21) |
|  | Tunisia | 389 | (6.6) | 393 | (7.7) | 379 | (7.1) | 392 | (11.4) | -1.6 | (4.71) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.42) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 408 | (4.2) | 436 | (5.2) | 447 | (4.4) | 449 | (5.8) | 14.6 | (2.15) | 1.5 | (0.15) | 3.7 | (1.08) |
|  | Uruguay | 378 | (5.8) | 383 | (9.3) | 434 | (8.2) | 442 | (8.1) | 21.8 | (2.97) | 1.6 | (0.17) | 9.3 | (2.32) |
|  | Viet Nam | 500 | (13.8) | 510 | (7.9) | 523 | (9.7) | 512 | (10.6) | 7.0 | (6.39) | 1.4 | (0.28) | 0.7 | (1.23) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV.3.15 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of quality of physical infrastructure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 0.02 | (0.05) | 0.10 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.04) | 0.35 | (0.04) | 0.02 | (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.05) | 0.53 | (0.06) |
| U | Austria | -0.14 | (0.11) | -0.08 | (0.10) | -0.19 | (0.11) | -0.21 | (0.10) | -0.19 | (0.19) | -0.07 | (0.14) | -0.26 | (0.11) |
|  | Belgium | -0.16 | (0.07) | -0.19 | (0.07) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.08) | -0.17 | (0.11) | -0.24 | (0.09) | -0.03 | (0.13) |
|  | Canada | 0.31 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.04) | 0.29 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.05) | 0.25 | (0.09) | 0.36 | (0.06) | 0.29 | (0.08) |
|  | Chile | -0.46 | (0.11) | -0.26 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.09) | 0.34 | (0.09) | -0.51 | (0.11) | -0.18 | (0.18) | 0.41 | (0.12) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.48 | (0.07) | 0.47 | (0.08) | 0.48 | (0.06) | 0.36 | (0.07) | 0.39 | (0.16) | 0.53 | (0.07) | 0.27 | (0.12) |
|  | Denmark | -0.15 | (0.06) | -0.17 | (0.06) | -0.16 | (0.06) | -0.19 | (0.07) | -0.22 | (0.11) | -0.11 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.12) |
|  | Estonia | 0.24 | (0.08) | 0.11 | (0.07) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.05) | 0.15 | (0.16) | 0.18 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.08) |
|  | Finland | -0.26 | (0.08) | -0.32 | (0.08) | -0.33 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.18) | -0.37 | (0.08) | -0.39 | (0.11) |
|  | France | 0.27 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.15 | (0.10) | 0.40 | (0.11) | 0.07 | (0.10) | 0.22 | (0.14) |
|  | Germany | 0.02 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.08) | -0.02 | (0.09) | 0.01 | (0.11) | 0.03 | (0.09) | -0.12 | (0.15) |
|  | Greece | -0.31 | (0.11) | -0.24 | (0.10) | -0.16 | (0.09) | -0.04 | (0.08) | -0.39 | (0.19) | -0.26 | (0.12) | 0.14 | (0.14) |
|  | Hungary | 0.24 | (0.09) | 0.21 | (0.08) | 0.19 | (0.08) | 0.19 | (0.09) | 0.23 | (0.12) | 0.25 | (0.10) | 0.13 | (0.11) |
|  | Iceland | 0.37 | (0.03) | 0.33 | (0.03) | 0.36 | (0.03) | 0.29 | (0.03) | 0.06 | (0.01) | 0.49 | (0.01) | 0.24 | (0.00) |
|  | Ireland | -0.06 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.10) | -0.04 | (0.11) | 0.03 | (0.11) | 0.15 | (0.20) | -0.12 | (0.12) | 0.04 | (0.22) |
|  | Israel | -0.56 | (0.12) | -0.54 | (0.11) | -0.48 | (0.10) | -0.53 | (0.11) | -0.67 | (0.21) | -0.36 | (0.14) | -0.60 | (0.13) |
|  | Italy | -0.37 | (0.06) | -0.34 | (0.04) | -0.31 | (0.04) | -0.30 | (0.05) | -0.38 | (0.09) | -0.28 | (0.07) | -0.34 | (0.07) |
|  | Japan | -0.22 | (0.08) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.08) | -0.23 | (0.12) | -0.25 | (0.09) | 0.16 | (0.12) |
|  | Korea | -0.13 | (0.08) | -0.16 | (0.08) | -0.21 | (0.09) | -0.21 | (0.10) | -0.17 | (0.12) | -0.10 | (0.10) | -0.35 | (0.19) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.61 | (0.02) | -0.52 | (0.02) | -0.45 | (0.02) | -0.39 | (0.02) | -0.59 | (0.00) | -0.44 | (0.00) | -0.39 | (0.00) |
|  | Mexico | -0.76 | (0.05) | -0.48 | (0.05) | -0.34 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.06) | -0.80 | (0.06) | -0.37 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.08) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.30 | (0.09) | -0.31 | (0.08) | -0.25 | (0.09) | -0.26 | (0.11) | -0.28 | (0.13) | -0.35 | (0.11) | -0.17 | (0.17) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.10 | (0.10) | 0.02 | (0.10) | -0.04 | (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.12) | 0.34 | (0.16) | -0.11 | (0.11) | 0.11 | (0.16) |
|  | Norway | -0.31 | (0.10) | -0.35 | (0.08) | -0.30 | (0.08) | -0.26 | (0.09) | -0.15 | (0.24) | -0.38 | (0.09) | -0.10 | (0.21) |
|  | Poland | 0.50 | (0.08) | 0.54 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.08) | 0.42 | (0.10) | 0.58 | (0.12) | 0.53 | (0.09) | 0.33 | (0.18) |
|  | Portugal | -0.50 | (0.10) | -0.30 | (0.10) | -0.20 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.11) | -0.57 | (0.15) | -0.23 | (0.11) | 0.15 | (0.17) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.09 | (0.08) | -0.07 | (0.08) | -0.19 | (0.07) | -0.19 | (0.10) | -0.14 | (0.11) | -0.05 | (0.12) | -0.27 | (0.16) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.09 | (0.03) | 0.08 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.06 | (0.03) | 0.19 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.01) |
|  | Spain | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.06) | -0.19 | (0.11) | -0.09 | (0.08) | 0.39 | (0.08) |
|  | Sweden | 0.14 | (0.10) | 0.18 | (0.09) | 0.22 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.22) | 0.13 | (0.10) | 0.60 | (0.14) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.35 | (0.06) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 0.31 | (0.09) | 0.25 | (0.09) | 0.34 | (0.10) |
|  | Turkey | -0.47 | (0.09) | -0.30 | (0.08) | -0.30 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.09) | -0.57 | (0.14) | -0.29 | (0.12) | 0.21 | (0.12) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.12 | (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.09) | -0.07 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.09) | 0.57 | (0.11) | -0.22 | (0.10) | 0.12 | (0.15) |
|  | United States | 0.33 | (0.09) | 0.47 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.06) | 0.50 | (0.08) | 0.10 | (0.14) | 0.60 | (0.09) | 0.57 | (0.11) |
|  | OECD average | -0.07 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.01) | -0.03 | (0.01) | 0.02 | (0.01) | -0.07 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.02) |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{3}$ | Argentina | -0.77 | (0.12) | -0.50 | (0.11) | -0.27 | (0.12) | 0.06 | (0.12) | -0.90 | (0.15) | -0.54 | (0.18) | 0.35 | (0.14) |
| ๕ | Brazil | -0.70 | (0.07) | -0.55 | (0.06) | -0.28 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.06) | -0.83 | (0.09) | -0.45 | (0.08) | 0.46 | (0.10) |
|  | Bulgaria | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.25 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.10) | 0.41 | (0.09) | 0.15 | (0.09) | 0.02 | (0.13) |
|  | Colombia | -1.00 | (0.13) | -0.86 | (0.08) | -0.76 | (0.10) | -0.48 | (0.14) | -1.12 | (0.18) | -0.71 | (0.11) | -0.54 | (0.20) |
|  | Costa Rica | -1.01 | (0.10) | -0.88 | (0.08) | -0.72 | (0.08) | -0.23 | (0.11) | -1.09 | (0.15) | -0.84 | (0.10) | 0.03 | (0.18) |
|  | Croatia | -0.49 | (0.06) | -0.55 | (0.08) | -0.58 | (0.08) | -0.66 | (0.09) | -0.51 | (0.11) | -0.53 | (0.10) | -0.74 | (0.16) |
|  | Cyprus* | -0.04 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.02 | (0.02) | -0.06 | (0.02) | -0.13 | (0.00) | 0.10 | (0.00) | -0.08 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.07 | (0.08) | -0.07 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.07) | 0.03 | (0.09) | -0.17 | (0.10) | 0.01 | (0.11) | 0.12 | (0.14) |
|  | Indonesia | -0.71 | (0.09) | -0.65 | (0.08) | -0.52 | (0.09) | -0.21 | (0.15) | -0.76 | (0.10) | -0.58 | (0.13) | -0.10 | (0.15) |
|  | Jordan | -0.68 | (0.11) | -0.59 | (0.10) | -0.58 | (0.09) | -0.39 | (0.11) | -0.82 | (0.19) | -0.56 | (0.12) | -0.28 | (0.21) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.28 | (0.10) | -0.15 | (0.10) | -0.15 | (0.10) | -0.25 | (0.11) | -0.39 | (0.18) | -0.04 | (0.13) | -0.31 | (0.18) |
|  | Latvia | 0.50 | (0.06) | 0.36 | (0.07) | 0.34 | (0.07) | 0.29 | (0.09) | 0.60 | (0.11) | 0.37 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.15) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.31 | (0.10) | -0.05 | (0.09) | 0.01 | (0.11) | 0.11 | (0.09) | c | c | 0.31 | (0.03) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 0.11 | (0.07) | 0.04 | (0.06) | -0.06 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.11) | 0.02 | (0.08) | -0.28 | (0.12) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.29 | (0.02) | -0.23 | (0.02) | -0.10 | (0.02) | 0.18 | (0.02) | -0.27 | (0.00) | -0.51 | (0.00) | 0.38 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | 0.10 | (0.10) | 0.12 | (0.09) | 0.03 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.09) | 0.26 | (0.15) | -0.06 | (0.14) | 0.10 | (0.14) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.11 | (0.02) | -0.05 | (0.02) | -0.05 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.02) | -0.21 | (0.01) | -0.02 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -0.87 | (0.11) | -0.60 | (0.09) | -0.35 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.11) | -0.87 | (0.12) | -0.58 | (0.12) | 0.07 | (0.12) |
|  | Qatar | 0.47 | (0.01) | 0.41 | (0.02) | 0.41 | (0.02) | 0.57 | (0.02) | 0.36 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.00) | 0.58 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | 0.11 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.18 | (0.05) | 0.23 | (0.07) | 0.02 | (0.09) | 0.28 | (0.09) | 0.20 | (0.10) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.19 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.08) | 0.12 | (0.08) | 0.15 | (0.10) | 0.13 | (0.11) | 0.29 | (0.09) | -0.03 | (0.16) |
|  | Serbia | -0.32 | (0.10) | -0.32 | (0.10) | -0.35 | (0.10) | -0.36 | (0.09) | -0.52 | (0.16) | -0.17 | (0.12) | -0.42 | (0.14) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.25 | (0.12) | -0.17 | (0.10) | -0.17 | (0.10) | -0.16 | (0.11) | -0.27 | (0.19) | -0.31 | (0.16) | 0.02 | (0.16) |
|  | Singapore | 0.36 | (0.02) | 0.36 | (0.02) | 0.38 | (0.02) | 0.52 | (0.03) | 0.36 | (0.00) | 0.34 | (0.00) | 0.61 | (0.03) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 0.01 | (0.10) | 0.01 | (0.09) | 0.07 | (0.09) | 0.11 | (0.09) | -0.04 | (0.16) | -0.04 | (0.14) | 0.29 | (0.14) |
|  | Thailand | -1.01 | (0.09) | -0.94 | (0.09) | -0.81 | (0.09) | -0.74 | (0.10) | -1.11 | (0.12) | -0.76 | (0.16) | -0.69 | (0.16) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.24 | (0.11) | -1.30 | (0.09) | -1.28 | (0.08) | -1.16 | (0.09) | -1.26 | (0.16) | -1.35 | (0.12) | -1.08 | (0.12) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | -0.11 | (0.08) | 0.12 | (0.06) | 0.23 | (0.05) | 0.30 | (0.06) | -0.17 | (0.11) | -0.01 | (0.08) | 0.52 | (0.09) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.76 | (0.13) | -0.54 | (0.11) | -0.43 | (0.09) | 0.12 | (0.09) | -0.88 | (0.17) | -0.39 | (0.13) | 0.43 | (0.13) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.61 | (0.11) | -0.45 | (0.10) | -0.34 | (0.11) | -0.21 | (0.12) | -0.69 | (0.13) | -0.22 | (0.12) | -0.22 | (0.20) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
*See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 2/2]
Index of quality of physical infrastructure, by school features
Table IV.3.15 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of quality of physical infrastructure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | $\square$ |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
|  | Australia | -0.08 | (0.05) | 0.53 | (0.05) | 0.14 | (0.04) | 0.29 | (0.06) | -0.21 | (0.14) | -0.01 | (0.07) | 0.28 | (0.04) |
| U | Austria | -0.16 | (0.10) | -0.13 | (0.25) | -0.07 | (0.15) | -0.16 | (0.09) | 0.30 | (0.25) | -0.01 | (0.12) | -0.54 | (0.16) |
|  | Belgium | -0.09 | (0.12) | -0.21 | (0.08) | -0.35 | (0.10) | -0.12 | (0.07) | 0.25 | (0.41) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.27 | (0.13) |
|  | Canada | 0.30 | (0.04) | 0.45 | (0.11) | 0.37 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.05) | 0.52 | (0.12) | 0.35 | (0.07) | 0.26 | (0.06) |
|  | Chile | -0.65 | (0.12) | 0.27 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.19) | -0.10 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.39) | -0.33 | (0.12) | 0.05 | (0.10) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.45 | (0.06) | 0.41 | (0.19) | 0.40 | (0.08) | 0.51 | (0.07) | 0.43 | (0.27) | 0.39 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.09) |
|  | Denmark | -0.23 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.13) | -0.17 | (0.05) | c | , | 0.05 | (0.11) | -0.16 | (0.07) | -0.51 | (0.14) |
|  | Estonia | 0.06 | (0.06) | 1.10 | (0.16) | 0.09 | (0.06) | 0.23 | (0.21) | 0.46 | (0.13) | -0.07 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.10) |
|  | Finland | -0.34 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.23) | -0.32 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.03 | (0.21) | -0.37 | (0.09) | -0.26 | (0.08) |
|  | France | 0.20 | (0.07) | 0.16 | (0.19) | 0.37 | (0.10) | 0.12 | (0.09) | 0.41 | (0.28) | 0.19 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.13) |
|  | Germany | -0.05 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.23) | -0.03 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.28) | c | c | 0.09 | (0.07) | -0.31 | (0.11) |
|  | Greece | -0.23 | (0.08) | c | c | -0.08 | (0.26) | -0.19 | (0.08) | -0.18 | (0.35) | -0.37 | (0.10) | 0.19 | (0.13) |
|  | Hungary | 0.20 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.20) | 0.13 | (0.15) | 0.22 | (0.07) | 0.64 | (0.30) | 0.18 | (0.10) | 0.21 | (0.10) |
|  | Iceland | 0.35 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.34 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.11 | (0.02) | 0.39 | (0.01) | 0.41 | (0.01) |
|  | Ireland | -0.04 | (0.16) | -0.05 | (0.12) | -0.04 | (0.09) | -0.02 | (0.10) | 0.12 | (0.21) | -0.28 | (0.13) | 0.28 | (0.21) |
|  | Israel | -0.54 | (0.09) | c | c | -0.50 | (0.14) | -0.54 | (0.10) | -0.57 | (0.13) | -0.60 | (0.15) | -0.45 | (0.17) |
|  | Italy | -0.38 | (0.04) | 0.52 | (0.14) | -0.69 | (0.13) | -0.32 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.32) | -0.36 | (0.05) | -0.30 | (0.08) |
|  | Japan | -0.30 | (0.08) | 0.26 | (0.11) | c |  | -0.13 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.33 | (0.12) | -0.06 | (0.08) |
|  | Korea | -0.21 | (0.09) | -0.13 | (0.12) | -0.18 | (0.23) | -0.18 | (0.08) | c | c | -0.11 | (0.17) | -0.19 | (0.09) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.28 | (0.00) | -0.47 | (0.00) | -0.53 | (0.00) | c | c | -0.49 | (0.00) | c | c |
|  | Mexico | -0.54 | (0.04) | 0.59 | (0.09) | -0.65 | (0.06) | -0.26 | (0.05) | -0.91 | (0.07) | -0.50 | (0.06) | -0.12 | (0.06) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.15 | (0.15) | -0.33 | (0.11) | -0.31 | (0.08) | -0.22 | (0.13) | c | c | -0.23 | (0.09) | -0.44 | (0.15) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.04 | (0.09) | 1.09 | (0.12) | 0.03 | (0.10) | 0.03 | (0.09) | 0.47 | (0.17) | 0.16 | (0.16) | -0.10 | (0.11) |
|  | Norway | -0.32 | (0.08) | c | c | -0.31 | (0.08) | c | , | -0.65 | (0.16) | -0.23 | (0.11) | -0.27 | (0.19) |
|  | Poland | 0.50 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.17) | 0.50 | (0.07) | c | c | 0.57 | (0.10) | 0.45 | (0.11) | 0.48 | (0.16) |
|  | Portugal | -0.35 | (0.10) | 0.47 | (0.14) | -0.48 | (0.09) | -0.09 | (0.11) | -0.19 | (0.20) | -0.35 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.15) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.11 | (0.07) | -0.39 | (0.20) | 0.06 | (0.09) | -0.29 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.15) | -0.07 | (0.08) | -0.55 | (0.20) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.04 | (0.01) | 0.46 | (0.03) | -0.13 | (0.22) | 0.06 | (0.01) | -0.72 | (0.34) | 0.17 | (0.01) | -0.10 | (0.03) |
|  | Spain | -0.25 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.05) | c | c | -0.05 | (0.12) | -0.06 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.08) |
|  | Sweden | 0.16 | (0.08) | 0.52 | (0.18) | 0.20 | (0.08) | 0.61 | (0.24) | 0.29 | (0.16) | 0.18 | (0.09) | 0.23 | (0.19) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.56 | (0.17) | 0.36 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.12) | 0.65 | (0.15) | 0.30 | (0.06) | 0.10 | (0.13) |
|  | Turkey | -0.26 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.66 | (0.33) | -0.24 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.42) | -0.21 | (0.10) | -0.30 | (0.10) |
|  | United Kingdom | -0.04 | (0.08) | 0.13 | (0.12) | c | c | 0.04 | (0.07) | -0.34 | (0.22) | 0.03 | (0.10) | 0.17 | (0.12) |
|  | United States | 0.46 | (0.07) | 0.55 | (0.24) | 0.43 | (0.12) | 0.46 | (0.06) | 0.43 | (0.25) | 0.60 | (0.09) | 0.27 | (0.10) |
|  | OECD average | -0.09 | (0.01) | 0.29 | (0.03) | -0.08 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.04) | -0.05 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.02) |
|  | Albania | -0.57 | (0.07) | 1.02 | (0.24) | -0.51 | (0.09) | -0.35 | (0.10) | -0.39 | (0.12) | -0.65 | (0.12) | -0.15 | (0.14) |
| \% | Argentina | -0.74 | (0.13) | 0.30 | (0.14) | -0.70 | (0.14) | -0.19 | (0.11) | -1.06 | (0.25) | -0.36 | (0.14) | -0.24 | (0.14) |
| む | Brazil | -0.60 | (0.05) | 0.76 | (0.12) | -0.55 | (0.08) | -0.30 | (0.06) | -0.46 | (0.23) | -0.64 | (0.08) | -0.06 | (0.08) |
|  | Bulgaria | 0.19 | (0.06) | c | c | 0.21 | (0.15) | 0.19 | (0.06) | 0.29 | (0.34) | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.11) |
|  | Colombia | -0.95 | (0.10) | 0.20 | (0.31) | -0.87 | (0.10) | -0.71 | (0.09) | -1.38 | (0.19) | -0.98 | (0.19) | -0.52 | (0.10) |
|  | Costa Rica | -0.93 | (0.07) | 0.61 | (0.18) | -0.81 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.09) | -0.89 | (0.20) | -0.67 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.22) |
|  | Croatia | -0.56 | (0.07) | c | c | c | , | -0.57 | (0.07) | c | c | -0.47 | (0.07) | -0.76 | (0.13) |
|  | Cyprus* | -0.09 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.00) | -0.47 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.14 | (0.01) | -0.07 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.31 | (0.29) | -0.05 | (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.07) | c | c | c | c | -0.02 | (0.07) |
|  | Indonesia | -0.65 | (0.11) | -0.33 | (0.11) | -0.62 | (0.11) | -0.43 | (0.12) | -0.74 | (0.17) | -0.65 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.10) |
|  | Jordan | -0.69 | (0.10) | 0.08 | (0.22) | -0.56 | (0.09) | c | c | -0.81 | (0.22) | -0.69 | (0.14) | -0.35 | (0.12) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.23 | (0.09) | 0.56 | (0.45) | -0.18 | (0.10) | -0.27 | (0.12) | -0.28 | (0.15) | -0.31 | (0.20) | -0.10 | (0.17) |
|  | Latvia | 0.37 | (0.06) | c | c | 0.38 | (0.06) | 0.38 | (0.18) | 0.55 | (0.09) | 0.31 | (0.09) | 0.33 | (0.12) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.04 | (0.01) | c | c | 0.19 | (0.02) | -0.46 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.11 | (0.02) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | -0.01 | (0.06) | c | c | -0.01 | (0.06) | c | c | 0.11 | (0.11) | 0.07 | (0.09) | -0.15 | (0.10) |
|  | Macao-China | c | - | -0.11 | (0.00) | -0.23 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | -0.11 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | 0.07 | (0.08) | 0.33 | (0.49) | -0.03 | (0.23) | 0.08 | (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.26) | 0.09 | (0.11) | 0.06 | (0.14) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.07 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | -0.07 | (0.00) | c | (0.26) | -0.15 | (0.00) | 0.13 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -0.69 | (0.09) | 0.32 | (0.16) | -0.69 | (0.10) | -0.37 | (0.08) | -1.08 | (0.14) | -0.53 | (0.12) | -0.12 | (0.12) |
|  | Qatar | 0.60 | (0.00) | 0.24 | (0.00) | 0.54 | (0.01) | 0.44 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.00) | 0.46 | (0.00) | 0.39 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | 0.18 | (0.05) |  | c | 0.18 | (0.05) | c | c | 0.22 | (0.18) | 0.09 | (0.06) | 0.31 | (0.09) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.17 | (0.07) | c | c | 0.19 | (0.07) | 0.03 | (0.11) | 0.22 | (0.12) | 0.20 | (0.13) | 0.11 | (0.09) |
|  | Serbia | -0.35 | (0.09) | c | c | c | c | -0.34 | (0.09) | c | c | -0.32 | (0.12) | -0.40 | (0.12) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.18 | (0.10) | -0.28 | (0.41) | -0.33 | (0.11) | -0.07 | (0.13) | c | c |  | c | -0.19 | (0.09) |
|  | Singapore | 0.39 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.44 | (0.05) | 0.40 | (0.01) | c | c | c | c | 0.40 | (0.01) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | -0.03 | (0.11) | 0.24 | (0.13) | -0.16 | (0.14) | 0.17 | (0.10) | c | c | 0.00 | (0.13) | 0.06 | (0.11) |
|  | Thailand | -1.03 | (0.08) | -0.10 | (0.22) | -0.97 | (0.09) | -0.85 | (0.09) | -0.90 | (0.11) | -0.99 | (0.12) | -0.67 | (0.16) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.26 | (0.08) | c | c | -1.26 | (0.13) | -1.25 | (0.10) | -1.43 | (0.26) | -1.28 | (0.10) | -1.12 | (0.14) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | -0.30 | (0.10) | 0.47 | (0.07) | 0.07 | (0.12) | 0.15 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.14) | -0.03 | (0.12) | 0.24 | (0.07) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.60 | (0.10) | 0.57 | (0.13) | -0.73 | (0.12) | -0.18 | (0.10) | -1.13 | (0.34) | -0.57 | (0.14) | -0.02 | (0.12) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.45 | (0.09) | 0.19 | (0.34) | -1.04 | (0.28) | -0.33 | (0.09) | -0.61 | (0.14) | -0.37 | (0.14) | -0.07 | (0.17) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (ainा
[Part 1/2]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance
Table IV.3.16 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 0.68 | (0.03) | -0.53 | (0.04) | 0.22 | (0.04) | 1.05 | (0.08) | 1.98 | (0.01) | 0.97 | (0.02) |
|  | Austria | 0.22 | (0.09) | -1.21 | (0.14) | -0.20 | (0.08) | 0.56 | (0.14) | 1.74 | (0.11) | 1.16 | (0.07) |
|  | Belgium | 0.30 | (0.06) | -0.87 | (0.08) | -0.09 | (0.06) | 0.55 | (0.08) | 1.62 | (0.10) | 0.98 | (0.04) |
|  | Canada | 0.27 | (0.04) | -0.85 | (0.07) | -0.14 | (0.04) | 0.45 | (0.04) | 1.62 | (0.09) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
|  | Chile | -0.38 | (0.07) | -1.60 | (0.14) | -0.61 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.07) | 0.82 | (0.12) | 1.00 | (0.07) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.05 | (0.06) | -0.83 | (0.07) | -0.25 | (0.04) | 0.15 | (0.07) | 1.13 | (0.13) | 0.80 | (0.05) |
|  | Denmark | -0.15 | (0.05) | -1.05 | (0.09) | -0.38 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.05) | 0.83 | (0.11) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
|  | Estonia | -0.17 | (0.04) | -1.00 | (0.05) | -0.44 | (0.05) | -0.05 | (0.04) | 0.80 | (0.07) | 0.74 | (0.03) |
|  | Finland | -0.20 | (0.06) | -1.13 | (0.07) | -0.51 | (0.05) | -0.05 | (0.07) | 0.88 | (0.11) | 0.82 | (0.05) |
|  | France | 0.38 | (0.07) | -0.75 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.06) | 0.52 | (0.10) | 1.80 | (0.09) | 0.98 | (0.04) |
|  | Germany | 0.09 | (0.07) | -0.92 | (0.07) | -0.25 | (0.06) | 0.22 | (0.09) | 1.31 | (0.12) | 0.89 | (0.05) |
|  | Greece | -0.35 | (0.07) | -1.45 | (0.16) | -0.61 | (0.05) | -0.17 | (0.05) | 0.83 | (0.12) | 0.96 | (0.07) |
|  | Hungary | 0.17 | (0.06) | -0.90 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.08) | 0.40 | (0.07) | 1.25 | (0.10) | 0.84 | (0.05) |
|  | Iceland | -0.34 | (0.00) | -1.33 | (0.01) | -0.62 | (0.00) | -0.21 | (0.01) | 0.79 | (0.01) | 0.85 | (0.00) |
|  | Ireland | 0.11 | (0.08) | -1.04 | (0.09) | -0.26 | (0.07) | 0.28 | (0.09) | 1.46 | (0.15) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
|  | Israel | -0.35 | (0.09) | -1.61 | (0.10) | -0.80 | (0.08) | -0.12 | (0.13) | 1.14 | (0.14) | 1.10 | (0.06) |
|  | Italy | 0.05 | (0.04) | -0.95 | (0.05) | -0.30 | (0.03) | 0.19 | (0.04) | 1.25 | (0.08) | 0.89 | (0.03) |
|  | Japan | 0.44 | (0.08) | -0.81 | (0.10) | 0.03 | (0.07) | 0.66 | (0.12) | 1.87 | (0.10) | 1.02 | (0.04) |
|  | Korea | 0.06 | (0.08) | -1.00 | (0.13) | -0.25 | (0.06) | 0.22 | (0.09) | 1.28 | (0.15) | 0.92 | (0.07) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.04 | (0.00) | -0.76 | (0.00) | -0.31 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.00) | 1.17 | (0.00) | 0.78 | (0.00) |
|  | Mexico | -0.86 | (0.04) | -2.26 | (0.05) | -1.23 | (0.06) | -0.52 | (0.05) | 0.57 | (0.07) | 1.14 | (0.03) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.19 | (0.08) | -0.92 | (0.08) | -0.22 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.10) | 1.51 | (0.15) | 0.95 | (0.05) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.20 | (0.08) | -0.85 | (0.09) | -0.28 | (0.08) | 0.29 | (0.10) | 1.63 | (0.13) | 0.98 | (0.05) |
|  | Norway | -0.19 | (0.06) | -1.04 | (0.06) | -0.57 | (0.05) | -0.08 | (0.07) | 0.93 | (0.14) | 0.82 | (0.05) |
|  | Poland | 0.36 | (0.08) | -0.68 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.08) | 0.53 | (0.08) | 1.62 | (0.15) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
|  | Portugal | 0.17 | (0.08) | -0.91 | (0.11) | -0.15 | (0.07) | 0.38 | (0.11) | 1.36 | (0.14) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.54 | (0.05) | -1.36 | (0.06) | -0.75 | (0.06) | -0.37 | (0.05) | 0.30 | (0.09) | 0.69 | (0.04) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.43 | (0.01) | -0.50 | (0.01) | 0.05 | (0.01) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 1.65 | (0.03) | 0.84 | (0.01) |
|  | Spain | 0.02 | (0.05) | -0.98 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.04) | 0.18 | (0.05) | 1.17 | (0.09) | 0.86 | (0.03) |
|  | Sweden | 0.05 | (0.06) | -0.92 | (0.10) | -0.22 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.06) | 1.09 | (0.11) | 0.83 | (0.06) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.55 | (0.07) | -0.57 | (0.06) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.88 | (0.11) | 1.78 | (0.09) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
|  | Turkey | -0.40 | (0.06) | -1.52 | (0.10) | -0.64 | (0.08) | -0.17 | (0.06) | 0.73 | (0.12) | 0.92 | (0.06) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.51 | (0.08) | -0.74 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.05) | 0.81 | (0.21) | 1.98 | (0.01) | 1.06 | (0.03) |
|  | United States | 0.38 | (0.08) | -0.89 | (0.10) | -0.13 | (0.08) | 0.63 | (0.15) | 1.92 | (0.09) | 1.07 | (0.05) |
|  | OECD average | 0.05 | (0.01) | -1.02 | (0.01) | -0.30 | (0.01) | 0.25 | (0.02) | 1.29 | (0.02) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
| 垉 | Albania | -0.41 | (0.06) | -1.37 | (0.08) | -0.69 | (0.06) | -0.27 | (0.05) | 0.68 | (0.13) | 0.83 | (0.05) |
|  | Argentina | -0.54 | (0.09) | -1.87 | (0.13) | -0.80 | (0.09) | -0.26 | (0.07) | 0.77 | (0.15) | 1.07 | (0.06) |
|  | Brazil | -0.54 | (0.05) | -1.76 | (0.06) | -0.92 | (0.05) | -0.33 | (0.06) | 0.86 | (0.10) | 1.05 | (0.04) |
| こ | Bulgaria | -0.04 | (0.07) | -1.05 | (0.07) | -0.38 | (0.08) | 0.15 | (0.08) | 1.14 | (0.11) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
|  | Colombia | -1.38 | (0.07) | -2.84 | (0.11) | -1.68 | (0.14) | -1.05 | (0.07) | 0.06 | (0.09) | 1.17 | (0.06) |
|  | Costa Rica | -1.08 | (0.08) | -2.58 | (0.12) | -1.48 | (0.10) | -0.77 | (0.09) | 0.52 | (0.12) | 1.24 | (0.06) |
|  | Croatia | -0.50 | (0.05) | -1.32 | (0.09) | -0.68 | (0.06) | -0.33 | (0.06) | 0.33 | (0.07) | 0.66 | (0.04) |
|  | Cyprus* | 0.25 | (0.00) | -0.85 | (0.00) | -0.28 | (0.00) | 0.47 | (0.01) | 1.67 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.44 | (0.07) | -0.62 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.07) | 0.61 | (0.09) | 1.78 | (0.13) | 0.93 | (0.04) |
|  | Indonesia | -0.76 | (0.10) | -2.13 | (0.16) | -1.09 | (0.12) | -0.48 | (0.10) | 0.67 | (0.16) | 1.12 | (0.08) |
|  | Jordan | -0.45 | (0.08) | -1.68 | (0.12) | -0.73 | (0.07) | -0.23 | (0.10) | 0.85 | (0.13) | 1.02 | (0.06) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.68 | (0.07) | -1.80 | (0.11) | -0.98 | (0.08) | -0.48 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.12) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
|  | Latvia | 0.04 | (0.05) | -0.83 | (0.07) | -0.20 | (0.06) | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.98 | (0.12) | 0.73 | (0.05) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.77 | (0.01) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.51 | (0.01) |
|  | Lithuania | 0.15 | (0.05) | -0.62 | (0.05) | -0.13 | (0.05) | 0.27 | (0.06) | 1.07 | (0.10) | 0.69 | (0.04) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.36 | (0.00) | -0.86 | (0.00) | -0.15 | (0.00) | 0.75 | (0.00) | 1.70 | (0.00) | 1.02 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | -0.21 | (0.07) | -1.26 | (0.07) | -0.53 | (0.09) | -0.02 | (0.06) | 0.97 | (0.14) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.48 | (0.00) | -1.23 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.37 | (0.00) | 0.43 | (0.00) | 0.65 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -1.16 | (0.08) | -2.73 | (0.10) | -1.53 | (0.08) | -0.74 | (0.10) | 0.38 | (0.14) | 1.24 | (0.06) |
|  | Qatar | 0.78 | (0.00) | -0.40 | (0.00) | 0.28 | (0.00) | 1.25 | (0.00) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 0.98 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | 0.22 | (0.06) | -0.71 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.06) | 0.38 | (0.06) | 1.33 | (0.14) | 0.82 | (0.05) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.48 | (0.07) | -1.56 | (0.09) | -0.76 | (0.05) | -0.28 | (0.07) | 0.67 | (0.13) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
|  | Serbia | -0.56 | (0.07) | -1.61 | (0.10) | -0.79 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.08) | 0.47 | (0.13) | 0.86 | (0.06) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 0.13 | (0.09) | -1.46 | (0.16) | -0.27 | (0.11) | 0.55 | (0.12) | 1.68 | (0.11) | 1.24 | (0.08) |
|  | Singapore | 1.19 | (0.01) | -0.06 | (0.01) | 0.94 | (0.02) | 1.93 | (0.01) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.00) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 0.58 | (0.09) | -0.96 | (0.18) | 0.13 | (0.11) | 1.16 | (0.18) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.20 | (0.09) |
|  | Thailand | -0.68 | (0.07) | -2.00 | (0.13) | -1.00 | (0.07) | -0.37 | (0.08) | 0.66 | (0.12) | 1.07 | (0.06) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.34 | (0.08) | -2.42 | (0.12) | -1.58 | (0.09) | -1.17 | (0.07) | -0.20 | (0.17) | 0.93 | (0.08) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 0.37 | (0.05) | -1.14 | (0.05) | -0.22 | (0.07) | 0.85 | (0.10) | 1.98 | (0.03) | 1.21 | (0.03) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.12 | (0.08) | -1.15 | (0.14) | -0.23 | (0.08) | 0.46 | (0.08) | 1.39 | (0.11) | 1.03 | (0.07) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.48 | (0.07) | -1.72 | (0.13) | -0.78 | (0.07) | -0.16 | (0.11) | 0.73 | (0.11) | 0.99 | (0.07) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 2/2]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance
Table IV.3.16 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 483 | (3.6) | 496 | (4.7) | 514 | (4.3) | 525 | (4.3) | 16.8 | (2.05) | 1.5 | (0.09) | 2.9 | (0.69) |
| U | Austria | 500 | (10.8) | 496 | (9.0) | 505 | (8.3) | 524 | (9.1) | 8.4 | (4.15) | 1.3 | (0.23) | 1.1 | (1.11) |
|  | Belgium | 494 | (8.6) | 516 | (6.8) | 522 | (7.9) | 528 | (9.8) | 11.5 | (5.36) | 1.4 | (0.19) | 1.2 | (1.18) |
|  | Canada | 510 | (4.2) | 520 | (3.9) | 523 | (4.2) | 519 | (4.0) | 3.7 | (2.19) | 1.1 | (0.08) | 0.2 | (0.21) |
|  | Chile | 400 | (6.2) | 416 | (6.0) | 438 | (8.2) | 436 | (7.3) | 16.2 | (2.72) | 1.5 | (0.18) | 4.0 | (1.31) |
|  | Czech Republic | 503 | (10.5) | 488 | (9.0) | 496 | (9.4) | 507 | (9.3) | 3.3 | (6.13) | 1.0 | (0.15) | 0.1 | (0.35) |
|  | Denmark | 494 | (5.3) | 499 | (5.3) | 498 | (5.0) | 512 | (4.7) | 7.1 | (3.32) | 1.2 | (0.12) | 0.5 | (0.41) |
|  | Estonia | 523 | (4.5) | 515 | (4.6) | 521 | (5.4) | 522 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (2.67) | 0.9 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (0.08) |
|  | Finland | 521 | (3.6) | 510 | (5.5) | 523 | (5.0) | 520 | (3.7) | 0.5 | (1.80) | 0.9 | (0.07) | 0.0 | (0.03) |
|  | France | 492 | (9.0) | 491 | (9.8) | 493 | (10.6) | 510 | (9.6) | 9.2 | (4.51) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 0.8 | (0.90) |
|  | Germany | 506 | (8.3) | 511 | (9.8) | 514 | (8.1) | 525 | (8.6) | 6.0 | (4.72) | 1.1 | (0.15) | 0.3 | (0.50) |
|  | Greece | 445 | (8.6) | 454 | (7.1) | 455 | (5.4) | 457 | (5.2) | 6.5 | (3.97) | 1.2 | (0.18) | 0.5 | (0.60) |
|  | Hungary | 475 | (9.2) | 469 | (10.1) | 484 | (10.7) | 482 | (10.3) | 5.5 | (7.52) | 1.0 | (0.18) | 0.2 | (0.56) |
|  | Iceland | 496 | (3.3) | 491 | (4.0) | 492 | (3.3) | 494 | (3.1) | 0.9 | (2.11) | 0.9 | (0.08) | 0.0 | (0.05) |
|  | Ireland | 498 | (5.6) | 489 | (7.8) | 512 | (6.2) | 511 | (6.3) | 5.3 | (3.38) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 0.4 | (0.48) |
|  | Israel | 465 | (7.7) | 465 | (12.4) | 454 | (14.2) | 481 | (13.4) | 6.2 | (4.89) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.4 | (0.69) |
|  | Italy | 472 | (4.7) | 488 | (5.2) | 491 | (4.5) | 498 | (4.7) | 9.6 | (2.87) | 1.3 | (0.11) | 0.8 | (0.49) |
|  | Japan | 539 | (11.3) | 538 | (10.1) | 522 | (9.0) | 547 | (9.4) | 2.5 | (6.20) | 1.1 | (0.22) | 0.1 | (0.46) |
|  | Korea | 553 | (12.7) | 552 | (11.0) | 563 | (10.5) | 547 | (10.8) | -2.3 | (6.13) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 0.0 | (0.33) |
|  | Luxembourg | 478 | (2.1) | 469 | (2.6) | 505 | (2.5) | 507 | (2.2) | 18.5 | (1.31) | 1.2 | (0.06) | 2.3 | (0.32) |
|  | Mexico | 389 | (3.0) | 408 | (2.9) | 420 | (2.8) | 436 | (3.7) | 16.6 | (1.50) | 1.7 | (0.11) | 6.5 | (1.24) |
|  | Netherlands | 520 | (10.1) | 505 | (12.0) | 531 | (18.0) | 522 | (14.9) | 3.3 | (6.73) | 0.9 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.58) |
|  | New Zealand | 486 | (7.2) | 499 | (6.6) | 497 | (7.8) | 526 | (9.1) | 13.8 | (4.51) | 1.3 | (0.18) | 1.8 | (1.17) |
|  | Norway | 492 | (5.6) | 488 | (6.1) | 486 | (6.0) | 495 | (5.5) | 1.8 | (3.85) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.0 | (0.16) |
|  | Poland | 510 | (6.0) | 520 | (7.7) | 521 | (6.6) | 518 | (7.0) | 4.3 | (3.82) | 1.1 | (0.12) | 0.2 | (0.37) |
|  | Portugal | 470 | (9.8) | 484 | (8.7) | 488 | (8.8) | 504 | (6.8) | 15.0 | (3.71) | 1.3 | (0.18) | 2.1 | (1.08) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 480 | (9.3) | 494 | (9.7) | 472 | (11.6) | 480 | (9.5) | 0.0 | (7.72) | 1.0 | (0.18) | 0.0 | (0.24) |
|  | Slovenia | 483 | (3.1) | 509 | (3.2) | 513 | (3.1) | 510 | (3.5) | 7.2 | (1.57) | 1.4 | (0.11) | 0.4 | (0.19) |
|  | Spain | 478 | (4.2) | 481 | (4.6) | 484 | (5.6) | 495 | (3.5) | 6.5 | (2.35) | 1.1 | (0.11) | 0.4 | (0.28) |
|  | Sweden | 474 | (5.3) | 482 | (5.7) | 475 | (5.2) | 482 | (4.8) | 3.5 | (3.25) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.1 | (0.18) |
|  | Switzerland | 514 | (5.5) | 527 | (7.6) | 536 | (8.8) | 551 | (6.5) | 14.3 | (3.25) | 1.3 | (0.13) | 2.0 | (0.87) |
|  | Turkey | 424 | (10.7) | 438 | (8.3) | 448 | (11.8) | 482 | (14.2) | 24.2 | (6.84) | 1.5 | (0.21) | 5.9 | (3.20) |
|  | United Kingdom | 491 | (6.8) | 500 | (6.1) | 488 | (7.2) | 502 | (11.6) | 3.2 | (5.51) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.1 | (0.48) |
|  | United States | 470 | (7.1) | 474 | (10.4) | 490 | (10.3) | 496 | (6.6) | 9.6 | (3.17) | 1.3 | (0.18) | 1.3 | (0.86) |
|  | OECD average | 486 | (1.3) | 491 | (1.3) | 496 | (1.4) | 504 | (1.4) | 7.7 | (0.75) | 1.2 | (0.03) | 1.1 | (0.15) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 389 | (4.0) | 389 | (5.2) | 395 | (4.0) | 404 | (3.7) | 4.5 | (2.52) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.2 | (0.18) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | Argentina | 366 | (9.0) | 393 | (6.5) | 385 | (7.0) | 409 | (7.2) | 15.4 | (3.57) | 1.6 | (0.24) | 4.6 | (2.02) |
| ส | Brazil | 372 | (3.3) | 381 | (3.4) | 386 | (4.5) | 425 | (6.0) | 20.7 | (2.32) | 1.3 | (0.08) | 7.7 | (1.63) |
|  | Bulgaria | 409 | (10.2) | 436 | (9.1) | 455 | (10.2) | 455 | (10.8) | 20.8 | (6.53) | 1.6 | (0.23) | 3.8 | (2.31) |
|  | Colombia | 356 | (5.5) | 370 | (6.2) | 381 | (6.8) | 398 | (7.4) | 13.4 | (3.04) | 1.5 | (0.19) | 4.4 | (1.96) |
|  | Costa Rica | 386 | (7.9) | 393 | (5.6) | 412 | (8.0) | 436 | (8.2) | 17.9 | (3.03) | 1.6 | (0.24) | 10.4 | (3.24) |
|  | Croatia | 472 | (7.8) | 465 | (9.9) | 458 | (8.7) | 488 | (10.5) | 4.3 | (6.58) | 1.0 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.34) |
|  | Cyprus* | 428 | (2.7) | 449 | (2.7) | 422 | (2.5) | 457 | (2.2) | 7.7 | (1.09) | 1.2 | (0.07) | 0.7 | (0.19) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 570 | (9.2) | 556 | (13.0) | 556 | (10.8) | 563 | (9.3) | 1.0 | (5.55) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.27) |
|  | Indonesia | 351 | (6.0) | 365 | (11.7) | 384 | (8.0) | 399 | (11.0) | 20.5 | (4.19) | 1.5 | (0.22) | 10.4 | (4.12) |
|  | Jordan | 385 | (5.8) | 378 | (6.8) | 379 | (5.7) | 400 | (8.4) | 9.0 | (4.66) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 1.4 | (1.41) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 439 | (6.5) | 428 | (8.0) | 424 | (7.0) | 438 | (6.6) | 4.5 | (3.66) | 0.8 | (0.12) | 0.4 | (0.57) |
|  | Latvia | 489 | (6.8) | 481 | (6.6) | 501 | (4.8) | 490 | (7.4) | 4.7 | (4.52) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.2 | (0.35) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | -75.4 | (8.19) | 0.1 | (0.04) | 16.5 | (3.27) |
|  | Lithuania | 462 | (5.6) | 483 | (5.7) | 486 | (6.1) | 485 | (6.6) | 13.2 | (4.93) | 1.3 | (0.14) | 1.1 | (0.82) |
|  | Macao-China | 538 | (2.3) | 529 | (2.5) | 528 | (2.2) | 558 | (2.3) | 9.3 | (0.97) | 1.1 | (0.05) | 1.0 | (0.21) |
|  | Malaysia | 409 | (6.7) | 414 | (5.2) | 421 | (6.8) | 438 | (9.1) | 14.9 | (4.79) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 2.7 | (1.79) |
|  | Montenegro | 397 | (1.7) | 442 | (2.4) | 395 | (2.5) | 404 | (2.2) | -5.3 | (1.48) | 1.2 | (0.07) | 0.2 | (0.10) |
|  | Peru | 332 | (6.3) | 348 | (5.8) | 378 | (7.6) | 414 | (10.6) | 24.2 | (3.57) | 2.0 | (0.21) | 12.6 | (3.07) |
|  | Qatar | 380 | (1.5) | 388 | (1.6) | 369 | (2.2) | 369 | (1.9) | -6.1 | (0.82) | 0.9 | (0.05) | 0.4 | (0.09) |
|  | Romania | 437 | (7.9) | 435 | (9.0) | 442 | (10.1) | 464 | (9.3) | 16.8 | (4.32) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 2.9 | (1.53) |
|  | Russian Federation | 471 | (4.6) | 477 | (5.8) | 487 | (5.6) | 494 | (9.1) | 6.8 | (3.93) | 1.2 | (0.11) | 0.5 | (0.59) |
|  | Serbia | 447 | (9.4) | 449 | (10.3) | 452 | (9.7) | 447 | (13.2) | -1.6 | (6.44) | 1.0 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.32) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 598 | (9.8) | 609 | (10.0) | 618 | (11.2) | 626 | (9.7) | 8.6 | (4.29) | 1.2 | (0.20) | 1.1 | (1.09) |
|  | Singapore | 565 | (2.3) | 563 | (3.5) | 585 | (3.2) | 585 | (3.0) | 6.3 | (1.45) | 1.0 | (0.06) | 0.3 | (0.13) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 545 | (9.3) | 575 | (13.7) | 542 | (10.6) | 579 | (9.8) | 9.7 | (4.79) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 1.0 | (1.07) |
|  | Thailand | 416 | (6.7) | 422 | (6.7) | 434 | (9.7) | 435 | (7.2) | 8.1 | (3.27) | 1.1 | (0.15) | 1.1 | (0.88) |
|  | Tunisia | 388 | (7.1) | 382 | (8.7) | 391 | (10.6) | 391 | (9.9) | 0.9 | (4.41) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.27) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 408 | (3.9) | 421 | (4.8) | 452 | (4.7) | 457 | (6.7) | 16.2 | (2.19) | 1.5 | (0.13) | 4.8 | (1.23) |
|  | Uruguay | 388 | (6.4) | 399 | (6.3) | 418 | (6.9) | 432 | (8.7) | 13.8 | (4.22) | 1.4 | (0.17) | 2.6 | (1.45) |
|  | Viet Nam | 503 | (13.3) | 510 | (7.9) | 522 | (10.7) | 510 | (11.2) | 6.1 | (5.79) | 1.3 | (0.27) | 0.5 | (0.95) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Index of quality of schools' educational resources, by school features
Table IV.3.17 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 0.49 | (0.05) | 0.60 | (0.04) | 0.73 | (0.04) | 0.92 | (0.05) | 0.41 | (0.08) | 0.59 | (0.05) | 1.13 | (0.07) |
| - | Austria | 0.20 | (0.10) | 0.30 | (0.09) | 0.25 | (0.11) | 0.16 | (0.13) | 0.04 | (0.18) | 0.45 | (0.13) | 0.10 | (0.19) |
|  | Belgium | 0.25 | (0.08) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 0.34 | (0.08) | 0.13 | (0.11) | 0.34 | (0.10) | 0.40 | (0.13) |
|  | Canada | 0.19 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.04) | 0.28 | (0.04) | 0.37 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.12) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.45 | (0.08) |
|  | Chile | -0.64 | (0.11) | -0.45 | (0.09) | -0.39 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.08) | -0.71 | (0.12) | -0.29 | (0.18) | -0.02 | (0.10) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.05 | (0.08) | 0.04 | (0.07) | 0.02 | (0.06) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.14) | 0.03 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.14) |
|  | Denmark | -0.21 | (0.07) | -0.14 | (0.06) | -0.12 | (0.06) | -0.08 | (0.06) | -0.36 | (0.14) | -0.08 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.11) |
|  | Estonia | -0.20 | (0.05) | -0.18 | (0.05) | -0.17 | (0.04) | -0.13 | (0.04) | -0.28 | (0.09) | -0.14 | (0.05) | -0.17 | (0.05) |
|  | Finland | -0.17 | (0.07) | -0.22 | (0.06) | -0.21 | (0.05) | -0.21 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.15) | -0.22 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.09) |
|  | France | 0.36 | (0.08) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.07) | 0.47 | (0.08) | 0.31 | (0.11) | 0.30 | (0.11) | 0.57 | (0.11) |
|  | Germany | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.08) | 0.08 | (0.08) | 0.12 | (0.10) | 0.09 | (0.11) | 0.09 | (0.13) |
|  | Greece | -0.45 | (0.08) | -0.44 | (0.09) | -0.33 | (0.08) | -0.17 | (0.07) | -0.52 | (0.17) | -0.42 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.12) |
|  | Hungary | 0.15 | (0.09) | 0.16 | (0.07) | 0.17 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.09) | 0.08 | (0.11) | 0.25 | (0.09) | 0.18 | (0.12) |
|  | Iceland | -0.35 | (0.02) | -0.31 | (0.03) | -0.32 | (0.03) | -0.37 | (0.03) | -0.43 | (0.01) | -0.41 | (0.00) | -0.16 | (0.01) |
|  | Ireland | -0.01 | (0.09) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.10) | -0.11 | (0.17) | 0.07 | (0.10) | 0.35 | (0.16) |
|  | Israel | -0.50 | (0.11) | -0.38 | (0.11) | -0.26 | (0.10) | -0.26 | (0.10) | -0.64 | (0.18) | -0.31 | (0.15) | -0.13 | (0.12) |
|  | Italy | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.05) | 0.07 | (0.05) | 0.10 | (0.04) | -0.07 | (0.07) | 0.11 | (0.07) | 0.08 | (0.06) |
|  | Japan | 0.36 | (0.09) | 0.41 | (0.08) | 0.44 | (0.08) | 0.53 | (0.11) | 0.33 | (0.13) | 0.32 | (0.11) | 0.72 | (0.19) |
|  | Korea | 0.06 | (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.11) | 0.03 | (0.11) | 0.10 | (0.12) | 0.02 | (0.18) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.10 | (0.02) | -0.01 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.02) | 0.22 | (0.02) | -0.14 | (0.00) | 0.26 | (0.00) | 0.17 | (0.00) |
|  | Mexico | -1.38 | (0.04) | -0.99 | (0.05) | -0.76 | (0.05) | -0.30 | (0.08) | -1.43 | (0.06) | -0.91 | (0.06) | -0.15 | (0.10) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.19 | (0.09) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.23 | (0.09) | 0.22 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.12) | 0.21 | (0.11) | 0.22 | (0.18) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.06 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.21 | (0.09) | 0.43 | (0.11) | -0.03 | (0.16) | 0.03 | (0.10) | 0.76 | (0.17) |
|  | Norway | -0.17 | (0.07) | -0.21 | (0.07) | -0.22 | (0.07) | -0.16 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.20) | -0.26 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.17) |
|  | Poland | 0.23 | (0.09) | 0.34 | (0.09) | 0.39 | (0.09) | 0.48 | (0.09) | 0.16 | (0.13) | 0.36 | (0.10) | 0.60 | (0.15) |
|  | Portugal | 0.07 | (0.10) | 0.13 | (0.09) | 0.20 | (0.09) | 0.28 | (0.09) | 0.17 | (0.14) | 0.07 | (0.12) | 0.40 | (0.14) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.58 | (0.05) | -0.53 | (0.05) | -0.56 | (0.06) | -0.51 | (0.07) | -0.58 | (0.08) | -0.50 | (0.06) | -0.58 | (0.10) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.38 | (0.03) | 0.45 | (0.02) | 0.39 | (0.03) | 0.50 | (0.03) | 0.45 | (0.02) | 0.32 | (0.02) | 0.54 | (0.01) |
|  | Spain | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.05) | 0.07 | (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.07) | -0.08 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.09) |
|  | Sweden | -0.01 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.12) | -0.02 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.15) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.49 | (0.08) | 0.52 | (0.07) | 0.55 | (0.08) | 0.62 | (0.08) | 0.46 | (0.12) | 0.51 | (0.11) | 0.71 | (0.10) |
|  | Turkey | -0.64 | (0.06) | -0.44 | (0.07) | -0.40 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.11) | -0.81 | (0.10) | -0.31 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.17) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.52 | (0.09) | 0.52 | (0.09) | 0.42 | (0.09) | 0.58 | (0.10) | 0.71 | (0.14) | 0.37 | (0.10) | 0.64 | (0.19) |
|  | United States | 0.20 | (0.10) | 0.36 | (0.09) | 0.46 | (0.10) | 0.51 | (0.10) | -0.04 | (0.17) | 0.42 | (0.13) | 0.70 | (0.15) |
|  | OECD average | -0.03 | (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.06 | (0.01) | 0.16 | (0.01) | -0.08 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.02) | 0.23 | (0.02) |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\text { § }}{ }$ | Argentina | -0.82 | (0.09) | -0.65 | (0.09) | -0.46 | (0.10) | -0.18 | (0.13) | -0.85 | (0.12) | -0.65 | (0.12) | -0.08 | (0.17) |
| ※ | Brazil | -0.80 | (0.04) | -0.74 | (0.05) | -0.54 | (0.06) | -0.06 | (0.08) | -0.85 | (0.07) | -0.74 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.11) |
|  | Bulgaria | -0.21 | (0.08) | -0.08 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.07) | 0.16 | (0.09) | -0.21 | (0.10) | -0.18 | (0.13) | 0.28 | (0.11) |
|  | Colombia | -1.70 | (0.11) | -1.50 | (0.08) | -1.35 | (0.08) | -0.97 | (0.10) | -1.87 | (0.16) | -1.33 | (0.10) | -0.96 | (0.18) |
|  | Costa Rica | -1.51 | (0.12) | -1.21 | (0.10) | -1.08 | (0.10) | -0.50 | (0.13) | -1.54 | (0.16) | -1.21 | (0.13) | -0.21 | (0.17) |
|  | Croatia | -0.49 | (0.06) | -0.47 | (0.06) | -0.54 | (0.06) | -0.50 | (0.07) | -0.46 | (0.09) | -0.50 | (0.08) | -0.57 | (0.13) |
|  | Cyprus* | 0.10 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.03) | 0.34 | (0.03) | 0.42 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.00) | 0.27 | (0.00) | 0.61 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.39 | (0.09) | 0.39 | (0.08) | 0.48 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.10) | 0.34 | (0.13) | 0.46 | (0.11) | 0.57 | (0.15) |
|  | Indonesia | -1.03 | (0.11) | -0.96 | (0.10) | -0.78 | (0.11) | -0.25 | (0.19) | -1.14 | (0.14) | -0.84 | (0.16) | -0.10 | (0.19) |
|  | Jordan | -0.59 | (0.10) | -0.50 | (0.08) | -0.47 | (0.08) | -0.24 | (0.10) | -0.62 | (0.15) | -0.54 | (0.10) | 0.00 | (0.18) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.78 | (0.07) | -0.68 | (0.08) | -0.68 | (0.08) | -0.58 | (0.10) | -0.90 | (0.12) | -0.53 | (0.11) | -0.73 | (0.13) |
|  | Latvia | 0.00 | (0.08) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.07) | -0.13 | (0.11) | 0.18 | (0.08) | -0.10 | (0.10) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.95 | (0.04) | 0.80 | (0.06) | 0.67 | (0.06) | 0.65 | (0.05) | c | c | 1.08 | (0.02) | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 0.11 | (0.06) | 0.10 | (0.05) | 0.17 | (0.05) | 0.22 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.09) | 0.12 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.10) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.24 | (0.02) | 0.26 | (0.02) | 0.34 | (0.02) | 0.60 | (0.02) | 0.28 | (0.00) | 0.08 | (0.00) | 0.66 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | -0.37 | (0.08) | -0.28 | (0.07) | -0.17 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.10) | -0.46 | (0.11) | -0.19 | (0.11) | 0.01 | (0.14) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.46 | (0.02) | -0.47 | (0.02) | -0.50 | (0.02) | -0.50 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.34 | (0.00) | -0.53 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -1.78 | (0.10) | -1.36 | (0.09) | -0.92 | (0.10) | -0.54 | (0.13) | -1.83 | (0.12) | -1.29 | (0.12) | -0.32 | (0.14) |
|  | Qatar | 0.73 | (0.01) | 0.73 | (0.02) | 0.73 | (0.02) | 0.90 | (0.02) | 0.68 | (0.00) | 0.53 | (0.00) | 0.98 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.19 | (0.07) | 0.41 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.11) | 0.26 | (0.09) | 0.47 | (0.14) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.60 | (0.08) | -0.46 | (0.08) | -0.51 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.09) | -0.58 | (0.12) | -0.54 | (0.10) | -0.30 | (0.13) |
|  | Serbia | -0.54 | (0.10) | -0.53 | (0.08) | -0.60 | (0.08) | -0.58 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.15) | -0.45 | (0.09) | -0.67 | (0.13) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.06 | (0.12) | 0.11 | (0.10) | 0.18 | (0.11) | 0.27 | (0.14) | -0.21 | (0.20) | 0.16 | (0.15) | 0.39 | (0.19) |
|  | Singapore | 1.19 | (0.02) | 1.18 | (0.02) | 1.17 | (0.02) | 1.24 | (0.03) | 1.18 | (0.00) | 1.19 | (0.01) | 1.22 | (0.02) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 0.47 | (0.11) | 0.51 | (0.10) | 0.61 | (0.10) | 0.73 | (0.11) | 0.38 | (0.19) | 0.54 | (0.14) | 0.85 | (0.15) |
|  | Thailand | -1.03 | (0.08) | -0.82 | (0.08) | -0.56 | (0.09) | -0.31 | (0.10) | -1.08 | (0.10) | -0.73 | (0.11) | -0.09 | (0.14) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.42 | (0.11) | -1.42 | (0.08) | -1.34 | (0.08) | -1.18 | (0.11) | -1.58 | (0.17) | -1.31 | (0.10) | -1.13 | (0.16) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.34 | (0.06) | 0.44 | (0.05) | 0.55 | (0.06) | 0.11 | (0.09) | 0.25 | (0.09) | 0.69 | (0.10) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.04 | (0.09) | 0.02 | (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.09) | 0.44 | (0.10) | -0.07 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.11) | 0.66 | (0.13) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.68 | (0.10) | -0.57 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.08) | -0.21 | (0.11) | -0.76 | (0.13) | -0.45 | (0.13) | -0.11 | (0.16) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
*See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink ज्ञाist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 2/2]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources, by school features
Table IV.3.17 Results based on school principals' reports


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (ainा
[Part 1/1]
Availability of computers at school
Table IV.3.18 Results based on school principals' reports


[Part 1/1]
Instructional use of Internet
Table IV.3.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | School principals' report on how much of the work, in all subjects combined, expected from 15-year-olds in the national modal grade requires Internet access: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Work during lessons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Homework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Assignments or projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | <10\% |  | 10-50\% |  | 51-75\% |  | >75\% |  | <10\% |  | 10-50\% |  | 51-75\% |  | >75\% |  | <10\% |  | 10-50\% |  | 51-75\% |  | >75\% |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 8.5 | (1.1) | 78.0 | (1.6) | 10.8 | (1.2) | 2.7 | (0.6) | 8.3 | (1.0) | 71.7 | (1.7) | 15.4 | (1.3) | 4.5 | (0.7) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 47.1 | (1.5) | 33.2 | (1.6) | 18.0 | (1.4) |
|  | Austria | 25.0 | (3.3) | 60.8 | (4.4) | 8.7 | (2.5) | 5.4 | (1.9) | 31.2 | (3.5) | 53.7 | (4.5) | 8.3 | (2.6) | 6.9 | (2.3) | 6.7 | (2.1) | 37.3 | (3.6) | 26.4 | (3.4) | 29.6 | (3.9) |
|  | Belgium | 44.1 | (2.8) | 51.9 | (2.8) | 2.6 | (0.9) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 38.1 | (3.1) | 52.4 | (3.5) | 5.1 | (1.6) | 4.4 | (1.2) | 17.7 | (2.3) | 51.9 | (3.5) | 21.1 | (2.6) | 9.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Canada | 38.3 | (2.7) | 56.7 | (2.9) | 4.1 | (1.1) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 19.6 | (1.9) | 66.3 | (2.3) | 11.0 | (1.7) | 3.1 | (0.7) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 51.2 | (2.4) | 28.6 | (2.3) | 14.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Chile | 15.5 | (2.6) | 56.8 | (3.5) | 14.6 | (3.1) | 13.1 | (2.8) | 5.8 | (1.5) | 40.4 | (3.8) | 32.9 | (3.6) | 21.0 | (2.9) | 5.8 | (1.7) | 36.9 | (3.7) | 31.3 | (3.7) | 26.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 32.3 | (3.5) | 66.3 | (3.5) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 32.7 | (3.3) | 63.3 | (3.5) | 3.2 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.6) | 29.6 | (3.5) | 58.1 | (3.3) | 8.1 | (1.9) | 4.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Denmark | 7.0 | (1.7) | 75.2 | (3.4) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 7.6 | (2.3) | 8.4 | (1.9) | 66.7 | (3.6) | 18.1 | (3.0) | 6.8 | (2.2) | 1.1 | (0.4) | 19.1 | (3.3) | 33.9 | (3.6) | 45.9 | (4.1) |
|  | Estonia | 25.8 | (2.4) | 70.7 | (2.6) | 2.3 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (0.8) | 16.7 | (2.4) | 76.5 | (2.7) | 4.8 | (1.5) | 2.0 | (1.1) | 10.0 | (2.0) | 53.4 | (3.3) | 22.6 | (2.8) | 14.0 | (2.2) |
|  | Finland | 47.1 | (3.5) | 51.0 | (3.5) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (1.0) | 48.1 | (3.2) | 48.1 | (3.3) | 2.6 | (1.4) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 8.5 | (1.5) | 51.2 | (3.1) | 27.5 | (2.7) | 12.8 | (2.3) |
|  | France | 49.0 | (3.3) | 50.5 | (3.3) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.5) | 28.4 | (3.2) | 66.9 | (3.5) | 4.3 | (1.5) | 0.4 | (0.5) | 10.3 | (2.0) | 63.6 | (2.9) | 15.4 | (2.4) | 10.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Germany | 41.0 | (3.5) | 54.7 | (3.4) | 2.8 | (1.2) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 32.6 | (3.2) | 60.8 | (3.4) | 3.8 | (1.4) | 2.8 | (1.3) | 9.9 | (2.0) | 43.9 | (3.8) | 29.4 | (3.0) | 16.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Greece | 45.0 | (3.8) | 48.2 | (3.9) | 2.5 | (0.8) | 4.3 | (1.6) | 24.8 | (3.6) | 60.2 | (4.2) | 12.4 | (3.1) | 2.7 | (1.3) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 18.9 | (2.9) | 26.0 | (3.4) | 52.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Hungary | 39.5 | (3.7) | 59.5 | (3.8) | 0.0 | c | 1.0 | (0.9) | 27.0 | (3.6) | 69.1 | (3.7) | 2.6 | (1.2) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 20.1 | (3.1) | 53.2 | (3.6) | 17.4 | (3.0) | 9.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Iceland | 60.0 | (0.2) | 40.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 46.8 | (0.2) | 52.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.1) | 25.5 | (0.2) | 71.9 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 67.4 | (3.9) | 31.9 | (3.8) | 0.0 | c | 0.7 | (0.7) | 45.6 | (3.9) | 47.8 | (3.8) | 5.4 | (1.8) | 1.3 | (1.1) | 24.0 | (3.5) | 46.1 | (3.9) | 16.6 | (3.0) | 13.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Israel | 50.4 | (4.0) | 44.1 | (3.9) | 4.9 | (2.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 25.8 | (3.1) | 61.2 | (3.9) | 8.8 | (2.4) | 4.3 | (1.8) | 12.5 | (2.4) | 55.6 | (4.1) | 19.4 | (3.2) | 12.5 | (2.8) |
|  | Italy | 23.8 | (1.8) | 60.0 | (2.4) | 10.6 | (1.3) | 5.6 | (1.0) | 16.6 | (1.9) | 59.2 | (2.1) | 16.1 | (1.5) | 8.1 | (1.2) | 6.2 | (1.2) | 35.8 | (2.2) | 27.6 | (1.9) | 30.4 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | 32.8 | (3.6) | 50.3 | (4.0) | 4.1 | (1.5) | 12.8 | (2.7) | 30.8 | (3.4) | 54.9 | (4.1) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 9.4 | (2.3) | 8.0 | (2.0) | 45.5 | (4.0) | 18.5 | (2.9) | 28.1 | (3.5) |
|  | Korea | 57.3 | (3.4) | 31.7 | (3.2) | 6.1 | (2.0) | 5.0 | (1.9) | 20.4 | (3.4) | 50.1 | (4.4) | 11.2 | (2.7) | 18.2 | (3.5) | 17.2 | (3.1) | 39.1 | (4.0) | 20.1 | (3.1) | 23.5 | (3.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 54.0 | (0.1) | 46.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 45.4 | (0.1) | 54.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 17.7 | (0.1) | 70.5 | (0.1) | 7.0 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 36.2 | (1.9) | 50.0 | (2.4) | 9.6 | (1.3) | 4.1 | (0.7) | 12.8 | (1.2) | 52.0 | (1.9) | 23.7 | (1.5) | 11.4 | (1.2) | 12.4 | (1.4) | 46.0 | (2.0) | 25.7 | (1.7) | 15.9 | (1.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 48.3 | (3.6) | 47.0 | (3.7) | 2.6 | (1.5) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 20.3 | (3.0) | 62.0 | (4.3) | 13.3 | (3.8) | 4.4 | (1.9) | 9.3 | (2.3) | 41.9 | (4.5) | 30.5 | (3.9) | 18.3 | (3.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 29.2 | (3.5) | 66.1 | (3.8) | 3.7 | (1.5) | 1.0 | (0.5) | 16.3 | (3.2) | 72.6 | (4.0) | 4.8 | (1.6) | 6.3 | (1.9) | 5.3 | (1.9) | 60.5 | (3.9) | 22.9 | (4.0) | 11.3 | (2.4) |
|  | Norway | 4.1 | (1.5) | 39.8 | (3.6) | 10.8 | (2.2) | 45.2 | (3.6) | 2.4 | (1.1) | 27.8 | (3.7) | 17.6 | (3.1) | 52.2 | (4.1) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 12.3 | (2.6) | 23.6 | (3.2) | 63.5 | (3.7) |
|  | Poland | 53.3 | (3.8) | 45.8 | (3.8) | 0.9 | (0.8) | 0.0 |  | 22.1 | (3.0) | 70.5 | (3.6) | 6.4 | (2.1) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 8.2 | (2.1) | 41.6 | (3.9) | 31.8 | (3.8) | 18.4 | (3.1) |
|  | Portugal | 42.5 | (4.3) | 54.9 | (4.1) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 21.9 | (4.1) | 65.4 | (4.6) | 10.4 | (2.9) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 15.8 | (3.5) | 59.7 | (4.2) | 19.1 | (3.2) | 5.4 | (2.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 11.9 | (2.8) | 75.6 | (3.0) | 7.5 | (1.9) | 5.1 | (1.2) | 30.8 | (3.8) | 60.7 | (3.8) | 6.2 | (1.9) | 2.3 | (1.0) | 8.3 | (2.3) | 52.6 | (3.8) | 23.4 | (3.0) | 15.7 | (2.2) |
|  | Slovenia | 20.0 | (0.5) | 66.7 | (0.7) | 7.7 | (0.6) | 5.6 | (0.2) | 7.8 | (0.4) | 68.2 | (0.7) | 15.6 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (0.4) | 45.5 | (0.7) | 23.7 | (0.7) | 20.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Spain | 29.6 | (2.6) | 61.6 | (2.6) | 6.3 | (1.5) | 2.4 | (0.8) | 15.0 | (1.8) | 67.7 | (2.6) | 12.8 | (2.6) | 4.5 | (1.1) | 4.8 | (0.8) | 42.2 | (2.9) | 27.0 | (2.7) | 25.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Sweden | 11.0 | (2.1) | 56.8 | (3.6) | 7.8 | (1.9) | 24.4 | (3.1) | 32.2 | (3.1) | 38.2 | (4.0) | 11.2 | (2.1) | 18.5 | (2.9) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 41.6 | (3.7) | 19.2 | (2.6) | 31.4 | (3.2) |
|  | Switzerland | 44.5 | (3.5) | 53.2 | (3.7) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 46.4 | (3.2) | 51.1 | (3.2) | 1.3 | (0.8) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 10.8 | (2.2) | 55.4 | (3.8) | 20.8 | (2.3) | 13.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Turkey | 24.6 | (3.4) | 62.0 | (4.0) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 7.1 | (2.0) | 49.9 | (4.0) | 28.1 | (3.5) | 14.9 | (2.8) | 4.3 | (1.5) | 36.0 | (3.3) | 24.3 | (3.5) | 35.4 | (4.2) |
|  | United Kingdom | 34.0 | (4.0) | 62.0 | (4.0) | 3.8 | (1.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 11.1 | (2.2) | 64.6 | (3.4) | 20.5 | (3.2) | 3.8 | (1.3) | 5.1 | (2.4) | 51.6 | (3.4) | 30.6 | (3.2) | 12.7 | (2.6) |
|  | United States | 33.3 | (4.1) | 58.4 | (4.3) | 5.6 | (2.1) | 2.7 | (1.4) | 21.8 | (3.4) | 70.1 | (3.8) | 5.9 | (2.0) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 4.4 | (1.5) | 56.1 | (4.0) | 28.8 | (3.8) | 10.7 | (2.2) |
|  | OECD average | 34.9 | (0.5) | 55.4 | (0.6) | 4.8 | (0.3) | 4.9 | (0.3) | 24.2 | (0.5) | 58.7 | (0.6) | 10.3 | (0.4) | 6.9 | (0.3) | 10.2 | (0.3) | 46.9 | (0.6) | 23.0 | (0.5) | 19.9 | (0.5) |


| n | Albania | 56.4 | (4.1) | 32.9 | (3.6) | 8.8 | (2.6) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 19.6 | (3.3) | 63.0 | (4.4) | 10.7 | (2.6) | 6.6 | (2.9) | 12.0 | (2.5) | 33.3 | (3.9) | 23.2 | (3.6) | 31.5 | (3.8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ | Argentina | 34.2 | (3.8) | 51.1 | (4.3) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 5.2 | (1.7) | 15.6 | (2.6) | 59.2 | (3.9) | 16.8 | (3.0) | 8.3 | (2.5) | 10.7 | (2.2) | 50.3 | (4.0) | 23.5 | (3.8) | 15.6 | (2.4) |
| ส | Brazil | 44.4 | (3.3) | 44.6 | (3.2) | 8.0 | (1.8) | 3.0 | (1.0) | 12.8 | (2.0) | 52.0 | (2.9) | 26.0 | (2.5) | 9.1 | (1.6) | 5.8 | (1.2) | 32.8 | (2.4) | 33.8 | (2.5) | 27.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 11.5 | (2.2) | 59.6 | (4.0) | 11.5 | (2.6) | 17.5 | (3.0) | 9.6 | (2.2) | 43.5 | (4.0) | 22.9 | (3.6) | 24.0 | (2.9) | 10.3 | (2.6) | 40.9 | (3.8) | 22.1 | (3.0) | 26.7 | (3.1) |
|  | Colombia | 29.3 | (3.9) | 46.6 | (3.9) | 15.4 | (3.1) | 8.7 | (2.1) | 9.7 | (1.7) | 53.2 | (4.4) | 23.6 | (4.1) | 13.5 | (2.4) | 10.6 | (2.4) | 49.5 | (4.2) | 24.4 | 3.9) | 15.4 | (3.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 48.2 | (3.5) | 37.5 | (3.5) | 9.6 | (2.4) | 4.7 | (1.4) | 13.6 | (2.9) | 43.0 | (3.9) | 29.4 | (3.8) | 14.0 | (2.5) | 11.4 | (2.4) | 35.6 | (4.0) | 28.3 | (3.8) | 24.7 | (3.1) |
|  | Croatia | 15.8 | (2.8) | 67.3 | (3.4) | 8.5 | (1.7) | 8.3 | (2.2) | 8.7 | (2.2) | 64.9 | (3.9) | 20.6 | (2.8) | 5.8 | (1.8) | 5.0 | (1.7) | 35.8 | (3.6) | 31.2 | (3.8) | 27.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Cyprus* | 43.7 | (0.1) | 45.0 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (0.0) | 6.3 | (0.1) | 15.8 | (0.1) | 56.5 | (0.1) | 18.1 | (0.1) | 9.6 | (0.1) | 12.0 | (0.1) | 48.9 | (0.1) | 18.9 | (0.1) | 20.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 61.4 | (4.1) | 36.4 | (4.2) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 0.7 | (0.6) | 24.7 | (3.5) | 70.6 | (3.7) | 4.7 | (1.7) | 0.0 | c | 9.5 | (2.6) | 61.0 | (4.4) | 21.9 | (3.5) | 7.6 | (2.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 40.7 | (4.1) | 46.1 | (4.5) | 6.5 | (2.0) | 6.7 | (2.0) | 22.0 | (3.8) | 62.9 | (4.4) | 10.6 | (1.9) | 4.4 | (1.8) | 24.5 | (4.0) | 53.2 | (4.9) | 13.8 | (3.0) | 8.5 | (2.2) |
|  | Jordan | 29.4 | (3.5) | 47.6 | (3.9) | 13.0 | (2.6) | 10.0 | (2.2) | 25.1 | (3.2) | 48.7 | (4.0) | 16.6 | (2.8) | 9.6 | (2.6) | 19.8 | (2.9) | 44.8 | (3.9) | 18.1 | (2.9) | 17.3 | (2.8) |
|  | Kazakhsta | 17.6 | (3.0) | 45.6 | (4.5) | 22.2 | (3.7) | 14.5 | (2.9) | 18.5 | (2.7) | 49.5 | (3.8) | 20.7 | (2.9) | 11.3 | (2.2) | 13.4 | (2.5) | 36.7 | (4.1) | 29.7 | (4.2) | 20.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Latvia | 34.2 | (3.4) | 59.8 | (3.2) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 15.2 | (2.7) | 74.5 | (3.0) | 6.3 | (1.3) | 4.0 | (1.6) | 7.3 | (1.8) | 58.2 | (3.7) | 23.7 | (3.0) | 10.8 | (2.4) |
|  | Liechtenste | 14.1 | (0.7) | 85.9 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 80.4 | (1.1) | 19.6 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.0 | (0.6) | 79.6 | (0.8) | 19.4 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Lithuania | 36.9 | (3.6) | 55.4 | (3.8) | 4.2 | (1.4) | 3.6 | (1.3) | 20.2 | (2.9) | 63.5 | (3.3) | 11.9 | (2.1) | 4.3 | (1.5) | 9.4 | (1.8) | 46.2 | (3.1) | 25.5 | (2.9) | 18.9 | (2.6) |
|  | Macao-Chin | 34.4 | (0.1) | 55.9 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.0) | 6.1 | (0.0) | 7.0 | (0.0) | 77.6 | (0.0) | 9.4 | (0.0) | 6.1 | (0.0) | 2.5 | (0.0) | 43.0 | (0.1) | 34.0 | (0.1) | 20.5 | 0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 56.0 | (4.0) | 34.8 | (3.9) | 7.0 | (2.2) | 2.3 | (1.2) | 38.1 | (3.6) | 45.2 | (3.7) | 15.2 | (3.0) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 20.7 | (3.1) | 39.7 | (4.2) | 22.5 | (3.4) | 17.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Montenegro | 16.7 | (0.1) | 51.8 | (0.1) | 14.0 | (0.1) | 17.5 | (0.1) | 19.0 | (0.2) | 42.1 | (0.1) | 38.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.7 | (0.1) | 43.9 | (0.1) | 14.6 | (0.1) | 27.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 22.6 | (2.9) | 57.0 | (3.6) | 13.3 | (2.4) | 7.1 | (2.1) | 19.8 | (2.7) | 59.0 | (3.4) | 16.1 | (2.6) | 5.2 | (1.6) | 18.4 | (2.7) | 49.2 | (4.0) | 19.7 | (3.3) | 12.7 | (2.5) |
|  | Qatar | 20.8 | (0.1) | 53.4 | (0.1) | 17.3 | (0.1) | 8.5 | (0.0) | 10.1 | (0.1) | 61.9 | (0.1) | 15.7 | (0.1) | 12.2 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (0.0) | 30.2 | (0.1) | 31.6 | (0.1) | 32.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 12.5 | (2.1) | 36.1 | (3.9) | 12.7 | (2.7) | 38.6 | (3.9) | 25.1 | (3.4) | 37.4 | (3.8) | 17.7 | (3.2) | 19.7 | (3.0) | 17.4 | (2.6) | 31.8 | (3.6) | 18.9 | (3.4) | 31.8 | (3.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 31.2 | (3.5) | 59.2 | (3.7) | 5.0 | (1.5) | 4.5 | (1.5) | 16.4 | (2.4) | 68.2 | (3.0) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 5.2 | (1.6) | 13.3 | (2.3) | 47.5 | (3.4) | 22.7 | (3.3) | 16.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Serbia | 29.0 | (4.1) | 62.9 | (4.2) | 2.6 | (1.3) | 5.5 | (1.6) | 35.4 | (4.5) | 59.1 | (4.7) | 3.6 | (1.7) | 1.9 | (1.3) | 47.1 | (4.5) | 35.2 | (4.2) | 10.7 | (2.5) | 7.0 | (2.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 30.9 | (3.6) | 65.1 | (3.8) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (1.3) | 25.8 | (3.8) | 70.1 | (3.9) | 2.0 | (1.3) | 2.1 | (1.1) | 11.2 | (2.5) | 51.6 | (3.9) | 21.2 | (3.5) | 16.1 | (3.2) |
|  | Singapore | 31.0 | (0.3) | 66.5 | (0.5) | 2.5 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 23.8 | (0.2) | 70.2 | (0.5) | 4.4 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.6) | 9.8 | (0.1) | 73.7 | (0.6) | 9.2 | (0.8) | 7.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 48.3 | (4.1) | 44.4 | (3.9) | 5.4 | (1.5) | 2.0 | (1.2) | 37.0 | (4.1) | 52.9 | (4.0) | 7.8 | (2.0) | 2.3 | (1.3) | 21.9 | (3.3) | 41.5 | (3.9) | 16.0 | (3.2) | 20.6 | (3.2) |
|  | Thailand | 8.7 | (2.4) | 59.4 | (3.7) | 18.7 | (3.0) | 13.3 | (2.4) | 6.3 | (1.7) | 58.3 | (4.1) | 19.1 | (3.0) | 16.3 | (3.1) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 44.2 | (3.3) | 23.2 | (2.8) | 27.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 61.8 | (4.0) | 25.4 | (4.0) | 3.6 | (1.6) | 9.2 | (2.4) | 63.6 | (4.1) | 27.3 | (3.9) | 2.3 | (1.4) | 6.8 | (2.2) | 45.3 | (4.0) | 34.7 | (4.0) | 8.4 | (2.5) | 11.7 | (2.9) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 28.8 | (2.0) | 54.0 | (2.5) | 9.9 | (1.3) | 7.3 | (1.0) | 11.3 | (2.3) | 57.4 | (2.8) | 16.9 | (1.5) | 14.4 | (1.7) | 5.2 | (1.9) | 30.3 | (2.4) | 26.0 | (1.9) | 38.5 | (2.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 23.6 | (2.6) | 54.2 | (3.5) | 14.5 | (2.5) | 7.7 | (1.9) | 6.8 | (1.4) | 46.4 | (3.7) | 25.7 | (3.1) | 21.1 | (2.6) | 14.1 | (2.4) | 38.5 | (3.7) | 17.1 | (2.7) | 30.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Viet Nam | 70.1 | (3.8) | 23.8 | (3.4) | 3.6 | (1.6) | 2.5 | (1.3) | 51.3 | (3.5) | 40.3 | (4.0) | 6.2 | (2.0) | 2.3 | (1.3) | 75.6 | (3.6) | 15.0 | (3.1) | 6.5 | (1.8) | 2.9 | (1.4) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV．3．20 Number of hours per year for 5－15 year－olds in public institutions（2011）

|  |  | ： | Number of hours per year of total intended instruction time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Age $5^{1}$ | Age $6^{1}$ | Age 7 | Age 8 | Age 9 | Age 10 | Age 11 | Age 12 | Age 13 | Age 14 |  | Age 15 （least demanding programme） |
|  | Australia | a | 714 | 991 | 991 | 992 | 993 | 997 | 995 | 1026 | 1002 | 1003 | 1004 | 949 |
| 4 | Austria | a | a | a | 735 | 735 | 765 | 765 | 905 | 935 | 940 | 1000 | 1050 | 1005 |
|  | Belgium（ Fl ．） | a | a | 831 | 831 | 831 | 831 | 831 | 831 | 955 | 955 | 955 | 955 | 448 |
|  | Belgium（Fr．） | a | a | 930 | 930 | 930 | 930 | 930 | 930 | 1020 | 1020 | m | m | a |
|  | Canada | a | a | 913 | 913 | 921 | 921 | 921 | 922 | 928 | 927 | 915 | 920 | a |
|  | Chile | a | a | 855 | 855 | 1083 | 1083 | 1083 | 1083 | 1083 | 1083 | 1197 | 1197 | 1197 |
|  | Czech Republic ${ }^{2}$ | a | a | 526 | 526 | 644 | 644 | 644 | 819 | 819 | 878 | 878 | 790 | 585 |
|  | Denmark | a | a | a | 690 | 713 | 803 | 803 | 833 | 840 | 870 | 990 | 930 | 900 |
|  | England | a | 798 | 798 | 893 | 893 | 893 | 893 | 912 | 912 | 912 | 950 | 950 | a |
|  | Estonia | a | a | a | 608 | 608 | 608 | 691 | 691 | 691 | 770 | 770 | 770 | m |
|  | Finland | a | a | a | 608 | 608 | 671 | 671 | 707 | 660 | 913 | 913 | 913 | a |
|  | France | a | a | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 964 | 982 | 1234 | 1144 | 1036 | a |
|  | Germany | a | m | m | 627 | 655 | 754 | 770 | 856 | 873 | 887 | 900 | 933 | m |
|  | Greece | a | a | 1188 | 1188 | 1170 | 1170 | 1164 | 1164 | 796 | 796 | 796 | 773 | a |
|  | Hungary | a | a | a | 611 | 617 | 611 | 780 | 780 | 853 | 902 | 902 | 1106 | 1106 |
|  | Iceland | a | a | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | 933 | 933 | 933 | 987 | 987 | 987 | a |
|  | Ireland | a | 732 | 732 | 915 | 915 | 915 | 915 | 915 | 915 | 935 | 935 | 935 | 935 |
|  | Israel | a | a | 906 | 910 | 946 | 1001 | 985 | 991 | 960 | 983 | 1000 | 1102 | m |
|  | Italy | a | a | 891 | 891 | 891 | 891 | 891 | 990 | 990 | 990 | 979 | 1089 | m |
|  | Japan | a | a | 663 | 707 | 760 | 797 | 797 | 797 | 866 | 866 | 866 | m | a |
|  | Korea | a | a | 560 | 560 | 635 | 635 | 703 | 703 | 842 | 842 | 867 | 963 | a |
|  | Luxembourg | a | a | 924 | 924 | 924 | 924 | 924 | 924 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 |
|  | Mexico | a | a | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | 1167 | 1167 | 1167 | 864 | a |
|  | Netherlands | a | a | 940 | 940 | 940 | 940 | 940 | 940 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | a |
|  | New Zealand |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Norway | a | a | 678 | 694 | 713 | 735 | 797 | 808 | 809 | 853 | 854 | 859 | a |
|  | Poland | a | a | a | 618 | 618 | 644 | 779 | 779 | 779 | 783 | 783 | 832 | a |
|  | Portugal | a | a | 1004 | 915 | 915 | 915 | 898 | 898 | 950 | 950 | 950 | 950 | m |
|  | Scotland | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Slovak Republic | a | a | 627 | 656 | 713 | 798 | 770 | 827 | 855 | 855 | 855 | 941 | 941 |
|  | Slovenia | a | a | 581 | 608 | 634 | 686 | 739 | 739 | 831 | 844 | 776 | 908 | 888 |
|  | Spain | a | a | 875 | 875 | 875 | 875 | 875 | 875 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 |
|  | Sweden ${ }^{3}$ | a | a | a | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | a |
|  | Switzerland |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Turkey | a | a | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 864 | 810 | 810 | a |
|  | United States | a | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | a |
|  | OECD average |  |  | 823 | 790 | 811 | 828 | 849 | 872 | 901 | 928 | 930 | 942 |  |
|  | Albania | $b$ | a | 525 | 525 | 578 | 604 | 604 | 709 | 761 | 761 | 761 | 761 | 761 |
| $\stackrel{』}{\leftrightarrows}$ | Argentina ${ }^{4}$ | c | m | m | m | m | 720 | 720 | 720 | 896 | 896 | 896 | m | m |
| ざ | Brazil | a | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | a | a | 438 | 455 | 587 | 587 | 848 | 848 | 848 | 848 | 1080 | 855 |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | a | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 |
|  | Costa Rica |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | a | a | 525 | 525 | 525 | 578 | 735 | 761 | 840 | 840 | 840 | 698 |
|  | Cyprus＊ | $b$ | a | 863 | 817 | 817 | 817 | 817 | 817 | 919 | 919 | 919 | 889 | a |
|  | Hong Kong－China | $b$ | a | 554 | 554 | 554 | 554 | 554 | 554 | 697 | 697 | 697 | 697 | a |
|  | Indonesia | a | a | a | 455 | 473 | 653 | 793 | 793 | 793 | 1020 | 1020 | 1020 | a |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | a | 731 | 878 | 878 | 907 | 907 | 936 | 1024 | 1024 | 995 | 1053 | 1024 |
|  | Kazakhstan |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | a | a | 499 | 537 | 560 | 607 | 653 | 700 | 747 | 793 | 839 | 839 |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | a | 673 | 761 | 772 | 878 | 878 | 878 | 995 | 995 | 995 | 1024 | 0 |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | a | a | 411 | 552 | 528 | 552 | 624 | 756 | 783 | 810 | 810 | m |
|  | Macao－China | $b$ | a | 587 | 587 | 587 | 587 | 622 | 622 | 833 | 833 | 833 | 800 | 800 |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | a | 510 | 510 | 510 | 599 | 650 | 663 | 765 | 765 | 698 | 919 | 840 |
|  | Peru | $b$ | a | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | a | 720 | 720 | 1056 | 1056 | 1056 | 1056 | 1056 | 1056 | 1056 | 1152 | m |
|  | Romania | $b$ | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Russian Federation | a | a | a | 385 | 499 | 499 | 499 | 814 | 840 | 893 | 919 | 919 | m |
|  | Serbia |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai－China | $b$ | a | 635 | 635 | 655 | 674 | 674 | 771 | 771 | 771 | 680 | 793 | 227 |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | a | 754 | 780 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 624 | 793 | 820 | 838 | 703 | 618 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | a | 624 | 624 | 624 | 780 | 780 | 858 | 858 | 1141 | 1141 | 1170 | 1300 |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | a | a | 833 | 833 | 833 | 833 | 833 | 833 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 |
|  | Tunisia | c | m | m | m | m | 800 | 960 | 992 | 992 | 992 | 992 | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | a | 919 | 919 | 919 | 919 | 919 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 850 | 850 | 850 | 850 | 850 | 850 | 850 | 589 | 589 | 589 | 589 | 589 |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |

1．Only if applicable to primary education．
2．Minimum number of hours per year．
3．Estimated minimum numbers of hours per year because breakdown by age not available．
4．Year of reference 2010.
Sources：a．Education at a Glance 2013：OECD Indicators（OECD，2013）．For further notes，see Education at a Glance 2013：OECD Indicators（OECD，2013）Annex 3，available on line：www．oecd．org／edu／eag．htm
b．PISA system－level data collection in 2013
c．UNESCO Institute for Statistics（World Education Indicators Programme）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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|  |  | Total class periods per week |  |  |  | Regular mathematics lessons |  |  |  | Regular language-of-instruction lessons |  |  |  | Regularscience lessons |  |  |  | Regular mathematics, language-of-instruction and science lessons |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of all class periods in a normal full week of school (class periods) |  | Variability in total class periods |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | S.D. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 26.5 | (0.2) | 9.5 | (0.2) | 236.3 | (0.9) | 60.2 | (1.3) | 233.3 | (1.0) | 56.2 | (1.3) | 227.2 | (1.3) | 65.8 | (1.6) | 693.5 | (2.9) | 157.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Austria | 33.2 | (0.3) | 7.9 | (0.2) | 156.4 | (2.4) | 69.7 | (2.3) | 144.3 | (1.7) | 48.5 | (1.4) | 199.8 | (4.8) | 146.8 | (5.1) | 499.7 | (5.2) | 182.0 | (4.7) |
|  | Belgium | 31.8 | (0.1) | 6.1 | (0.2) | 216.9 | (1.4) | 70.6 | (2.2) | 217.8 | (1.4) | 61.6 | (2.7) | 192.2 | (2.6) | 109.4 | (3.3) | 633.7 | (3.7) | 171.6 | (4.6) |
|  | Canada | 19.4 | (0.1) | 7.8 | (0.1) | 313.8 | (2.8) | 122.0 | (1.6) | 316.1 | (2.9) | 126.2 | (1.8) | 306.2 | (2.7) | 132.1 | (1.7) | 936.8 | (7.9) | 330.0 | (4.7) |
|  | Chile | 30.1 | (0.5) | 15.0 | (0.2) | 397.6 | (6.3) | 189.7 | (4.0) | 374.4 | (6.2) | 179.5 | (3.9) | 295.7 | (5.4) | 194.7 | (4.1) | 1066.6 | (15.6) | 490.1 | (9.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 32.6 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 182.3 | (1.9) | 43.1 | (1.5) | 179.1 | (1.5) | 40.0 | (1.3) | 216.4 | (3.2) | 131.9 | (3.8) | 578.2 | (4.4) | 155.6 | (4.2) |
|  | Denmark | 29.2 | (0.2) | 6.3 | (0.2) | 224.4 | (3.0) | 90.5 | (4.6) | 314.5 | (4.1) | 126.1 | (6.2) | 176.8 | (2.3) | 92.2 | (3.5) | 713.3 | (7.0) | 235.7 | (8.8) |
|  | Estonia | 32.8 | (0.1) | 5.4 | (0.2) | 222.8 | (1.0) | 31.3 | (1.4) | 198.2 | (1.2) | 42.5 | (4.8) | 196.1 | (2.5) | 106.3 | (2.2) | 616.6 | (3.4) | 127.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Finland | 29.3 | (0.2) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 175.5 | (1.5) | 38.8 | (0.8) | 152.2 | (1.2) | 37.1 | (1.0) | 188.6 | (1.6) | 70.0 | (1.3) | 513.6 | (3.4) | 104.7 | (2.5) |
|  | France | 23.3 | (0.3) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 207.0 | (2.2) | 88.4 | (3.0) | 214.8 | (1.9) | 89.4 | (2.6) | 173.8 | (2.7) | 120.5 | (3.1) | 597.0 | (5.1) | 227.5 | (6.0) |
|  | Germany | 32.9 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.1) | 196.8 | (2.6) | 75.7 | (6.2) | 190.8 | (2.1) | 67.5 | (4.6) | 254.8 | (3.6) | 106.8 | (4.4) | 639.8 | (6.8) | 187.5 | (10.8) |
|  | Greece | 32.6 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 209.0 | (0.7) | 24.7 | (0.6) | 170.5 | (0.6) | 16.4 | (0.6) | 229.2 | (1.6) | 46.7 | (0.9) | 623.3 | (2.4) | 62.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Hungary | 31.3 | (0.2) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 149.9 | (1.7) | 37.2 | (1.1) | 164.2 | (1.6) | 45.0 | (1.4) | 193.1 | (3.7) | 84.7 | (2.9) | 512.0 | (5.1) | 123.0 | (4.1) |
|  | Iceland | 33.8 | (0.2) | 7.8 | (0.2) | 243.9 | (1.9) | 84.2 | (4.0) | 238.1 | (2.0) | 85.9 | (5.0) | 141.2 | (1.5) | 68.4 | (2.4) | 619.3 | (4.2) | 178.1 | (6.6) |
|  | Ireland | 42.6 | (0.2) | 7.6 | (0.2) | 188.8 | (1.2) | 32.9 | (0.8) | 180.7 | (1.2) | 31.4 | (0.7) | 145.4 | (1.9) | 58.4 | (2.4) | 515.3 | (3.3) | 96.4 | (2.3) |
|  | Israel | 35.2 | (0.5) | 10.9 | (0.3) | 254.2 | (2.5) | 89.6 | (1.9) | 192.4 | (2.7) | 84.5 | (2.3) | 196.5 | (3.4) | 124.4 | (3.5) | 628.6 | (5.6) | 196.1 | (4.9) |
|  | Italy | 30.2 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.0) | 232.0 | (1.7) | 59.5 | (0.8) | 277.4 | (1.3) | 80.0 | (0.9) | 135.5 | (1.2) | 61.5 | (1.8) | 645.9 | (2.8) | 130.7 | (1.9) |
|  | Japan | 31.9 | (0.2) | 3.7 | (0.2) | 234.7 | (3.0) | 74.7 | (1.9) | 204.8 | (2.1) | 58.3 | (1.9) | 165.4 | (3.1) | 65.6 | (2.4) | 604.9 | (6.3) | 164.1 | (5.0) |
|  | Korea | 34.9 | (0.2) | 10.0 | (0.3) | 213.3 | (3.2) | 64.5 | (3.0) | 203.8 | (2.6) | 57.8 | (3.5) | 199.4 | (6.5) | 96.1 | (19.9) | 616.5 | (9.3) | 171.6 | (14.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 27.6 | (0.1) | 6.8 | (0.1) | 204.7 | (0.8) | 57.4 | (1.0) | 188.4 | (0.8) | 56.4 | (1.1) | 156.6 | (1.1) | 79.2 | (1.0) | 553.6 | (1.9) | 143.7 | (2.8) |
|  | Mexico | 23.6 | (0.2) | 13.9 | (0.1) | 253.2 | (1.7) | 113.6 | (3.1) | 232.1 | (1.8) | 120.9 | (5.2) | 251.8 | (1.8) | 141.5 | (3.6) | 734.4 | (4.0) | 286.2 | (5.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 30.9 | (0.3) | 6.1 | (0.3) | 170.7 | (2.9) | 100.0 | (15.2) | 168.8 | (2.3) | 82.9 | (8.1) | 164.7 | (4.5) | 152.2 | (6.6) | 500.6 | (6.6) | 243.3 | (9.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 24.5 | (0.2) | 7.2 | (0.2) | 240.8 | (2.0) | 49.3 | (2.6) | 242.6 | (2.0) | 53.6 | (4.4) | 247.9 | (3.5) | 103.0 | (8.3) | 731.2 | (6.4) | 166.8 | (9.4) |
|  | Norway | 27.5 | (0.3) | 9.4 | (0.7) | 199.0 | (2.4) | 93.3 | (13.8) | 217.9 | (2.2) | 78.3 | (5.6) | 144.3 | (1.7) | 59.7 | (3.3) | 554.4 | (4.4) | 160.2 | (8.4) |
|  | Poland | 33.5 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 198.1 | (1.7) | 26.1 | (1.1) | 219.7 | (1.6) | 25.0 | (1.1) | 169.3 | (2.5) | 37.6 | (1.3) | 587.1 | (3.7) | 55.5 | (2.3) |
|  | Portugal | 24.5 | (0.4) | 9.7 | (0.2) | 288.0 | (4.9) | 110.3 | (5.7) | 237.6 | (3.7) | 94.8 | (3.2) | 237.9 | (9.3) | 194.6 | (14.8) | 788.2 | (14.3) | 297.0 | (21.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 31.8 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 180.8 | (2.7) | 62.6 | (1.9) | 179.3 | (1.7) | 49.1 | (0.9) | 161.6 | (4.6) | 129.8 | (2.9) | 510.7 | (8.1) | 184.8 | (4.8) |
|  | Slovenia | 32.0 | (0.1) | 7.9 | (0.2) | 160.3 | (0.5) | 25.7 | (0.3) | 168.9 | (0.4) | 22.3 | (0.5) | 184.9 | (1.6) | 76.0 | (0.5) | 513.7 | (2.2) | 98.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | 30.9 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 210.3 | (0.9) | 46.0 | (2.0) | 203.3 | (1.1) | 49.3 | (1.9) | 184.3 | (1.8) | 96.0 | (2.2) | 598.1 | (3.1) | 143.6 | (6.6) |
|  | Sweden | 24.0 | (0.3) | 7.2 | (0.2) | 182.2 | (2.2) | 65.6 | (4.9) | 178.8 | (2.9) | 71.8 | (5.1) | 188.5 | (2.6) | 74.8 | (3.9) | 547.6 | (6.2) | 162.4 | (13.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 32.1 | (0.3) | 9.9 | (0.6) | 207.0 | (2.6) | 93.1 | (6.2) | 206.6 | (3.1) | 120.7 | (9.8) | 164.3 | (3.7) | 147.4 | (12.2) | 575.6 | (5.5) | 212.6 | (10.6) |
|  | Turkey | 34.7 | (0.2) | 4.3 | (0.1) | 171.9 | (2.2) | 72.1 | (2.0) | 198.9 | (2.5) | 72.0 | (1.3) | 166.9 | (6.3) | 125.0 | (5.6) | 537.3 | (9.2) | 197.9 | (6.7) |
|  | United Kingdom | 27.2 | (0.3) | 7.6 | (0.3) | 230.0 | (2.2) | 88.9 | (4.8) | 231.8 | (2.6) | 86.4 | (4.0) | 295.0 | (3.7) | 126.7 | (5.3) | 746.2 | (6.5) | 223.9 | (9.4) |
|  | United States | 19.7 | (0.4) | 14.0 | (0.3) | 254.1 | (4.9) | 131.9 | (5.4) | 257.7 | (5.0) | 145.0 | (8.2) | 254.9 | (4.9) | 137.2 | (6.1) | 764.6 | (13.5) | 349.2 | (13.3) |
|  | OECD average | 29.9 | (0.0) | 7.0 | (0.0) | 217.8 | (0.4) | 73.0 | (0.8) | 214.7 | (0.4) | 72.4 | (0.7) | 200.2 | (0.6) | 104.8 | (1.0) | 632.3 | (1.2) | 188.7 | (1.4) |


| Albania | 25.5 | (0.3) | 9.6 | (0.2) | 170.8 | (1.3) | 47.9 | (1.4) | 176.2 | (1.9) | 57.5 | (1.1) | 148.8 | (1.8) | 85.8 | (1.4) | 496.0 | (3.7) | 135.8 | 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 14.2 | (0.3) | 8.6 | (0.2) | 268.6 | (6.3) | 142.6 | (3.2) | 262.4 | (7.0) | 147.4 | (4.2) | 216.5 | (6.2) | 160.1 | (6.8) | 701.1 | (13.3) | 341.2 | (9.2) |
| ๕ Brazil | 21.6 | (0.2) | 11.1 | (0.1) | 214.7 | (1.7) | 94.4 | (3.0) | 208.0 | (1.9) | 91.8 | (2.0) | 161.6 | (3.0) | 106.2 | (4.1) | 582.5 | (5.3) | 227.1 | (6.3) |
| Bulgaria | 30.7 | (0.2) | 8.8 | (0.2) | 133.9 | (3.0) | 56.0 | (3.9) | 140.6 | (1.5) | 43.9 | (2.1) | 257.5 | (3.3) | 98.6 | (7.5) | 530.9 | (5.1) | 135.0 | (7.0) |
| Colombia | 22.6 | (0.4) | 10.6 | (0.2) | 262.6 | (3.8) | 136.0 | (5.0) | 231.7 | (3.5) | 113.2 | (3.4) | 205.0 | (4.0) | 122.7 | (4.7) | 702.0 | (9.5) | 309.3 | (9.9) |
| Costa Rica | 41.5 | (0.8) | 17.2 | (0.4) | 207.7 | (2.5) | 54.4 | (1.9) | 188.9 | (1.9) | 45.2 | (1.5) | 202.9 | (2.4) | 66.2 | (1.9) | 596.9 | (5.0) | 125.8 | (3.8) |
| Croatia | 32.4 | (0.1) | 3.9 | (0.1) | 147.1 | (2.1) | 44.8 | (1.3) | 164.4 | (1.2) | 34.3 | (0.9) | 182.2 | (5.4) | 119.9 | (2.3) | 494.7 | (6.9) | 157.7 | 3.2) |
| Cyprus* | 35.5 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 189.1 | (0.4) | 24.0 | (0.7) | 198.1 | (0.5) | 31.6 | (0.7) | 186.1 | (0.6) | 23.0 | (1.0) | 567.5 | (1.4) | 57.3 | (2.4) |
| Hong Kong-China | 40.7 | (0.4) | 5.8 | (0.3) | 267.6 | (2.6) | 72.7 | (2.5) | 279.7 | (2.6) | 75.4 | (2.9) | 235.4 | (4.2) | 158.0 | (3.8) | 781.9 | (7.0) | 230.5 | (6.3) |
| Indonesia | 17.8 | (0.7) | 13.9 | (0.3) | 209.4 | (4.5) | 136.8 | (4.4) | 181.9 | (4.5) | 138.2 | (9.4) | 198.9 | (6.7) | 165.4 | (8.9) | 584.5 | (13.6) | 382.2 | (13.6) |
| Jordan | 27.2 | (0.3) | 13.3 | (0.2) | 227.1 | (2.0) | 85.6 | (11.0) | 264.9 | (2.5) | 85.8 | (6.9) | 277.6 | (3.1) | 126.0 | (8.8) | 767.8 | (4.4) | 202.6 | (10.6) |
| Kazakhsta | 31.1 | (0.4) | 11.7 | (0.2) | 182.5 | (4.1) | 79.4 | (8.1) | 109.0 | (2.4) | 80.5 | (7.0) | 209.0 | (6.8) | 191.6 | (10.2) | 497.1 | (10.6) | 237.8 | (14.3) |
| Latvia | 35.5 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 224.4 | (1.5) | 42.2 | (2.6) | 157.7 | (1.5) | 44.8 | (2.4) | 229.6 | (3.5) | 113.7 | (1.6) | 610.1 | (4.8) | 136.3 | (4.0) |
| Liechtenstein | 36.2 | (0.5) | 7.5 | (1.3) | 210.7 | (4.5) | 64.4 | (6.1) | 201.5 | (10.2) | 147.9 | (64.0) | 166.5 | (11.7) | 168.2 | (49.1) | 579.4 | (18.5) | 266.5 | (69.3) |
| Lithuania | 32.4 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 171.8 | (1.5) | 36.8 | (3.3) | 203.4 | (1.3) | 34.6 | (3.0) | 320.7 | (1.4) | 58.5 | (2.5) | 694.8 | (2.5) | 73.2 | (2.6) |
| Macao-Chin | 40.8 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) | 275.0 | (0.9) | 58.4 | (0.9) | 265.2 | (0.6) | 46.6 | (0.6) | 188.7 | (2.2) | 131.9 | (2.7) | 726.5 | (3.0) | 172.7 | (3.8) |
| Malaysia | 30.7 | (0.7) | 17.4 | (0.2) | 201.2 | (3.7) | 97.3 | (3.4) | 202.2 | (2.7) | 77.8 | (1.8) | 188.6 | (2.7) | 91.0 | (2.8) | 579.9 | (7.9) | 229.2 | (6.9) |
| Montenegro | 26.9 | (0.2) | 10.0 | (0.3) | 142.2 | (0.8) | 50.8 | (5.8) | 149.6 | (0.8) | 45.7 | (5.7) | 105.2 | (1.1) | 64.0 | (2.0) | 398.0 | (2.1) | 121.5 | (9.0) |
| Peru | 25.0 | (0.4) | 14.1 | (0.1) | 287.0 | (4.3) | 152.6 | (5.6) | 259.3 | (4.0) | 138.0 | (4.5) | 215.0 | (3.8) | 125.0 | (7.0) | 750.1 | (9.6) | 333.2 | (11.8) |
| Qatar | 22.0 | (0.2) | 13.6 | (0.1) | 258.6 | (0.7) | 48.9 | (0.8) | 227.8 | (0.8) | 50.5 | (0.6) | 263.6 | (1.3) | 88.2 | (1.2) | 743.9 | (2.3) | 138.8 | (1.8) |
| Romania | 31.5 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 169.4 | (1.9) | 57.5 | (2.2) | 178.9 | (1.4) | 43.1 | (1.1) | 161.6 | (5.0) | 123.9 | (2.3) | 513.1 | (6.7) | 163.9 | (3.1) |
| Russian Federation | 35.2 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 222.5 | (2.5) | 63.1 | (2.4) | 135.1 | (2.1) | 55.2 | (2.1) | 279.5 | (4.3) | 150.4 | (4.1) | 635.9 | (6.6) | 192.0 | (5.7) |
| Serbia | 30.9 | (0.2) | 7.6 | (0.2) | 154.4 | (1.2) | 39.3 | (1.4) | 145.3 | (1.0) | 30.8 | (0.8) | 149.7 | (3.9) | 129.5 | (6.4) | 451.3 | (4.9) | 147.0 | (5.8) |
| Shanghai-China | 41.3 | (0.3) | 7.0 | (0.2) | 269.5 | (2.9) | 94.4 | (2.2) | 248.1 | (2.7) | 84.8 | (1.7) | 264.1 | (5.6) | 160.6 | (3.6) | 770.9 | (9.5) | 283.5 | (6.0) |
| Singapore | 45.6 | (0.2) | 13.5 | (0.2) | 287.8 | (1.3) | 80.8 | (0.7) | 223.6 | (1.4) | 45.7 | (5.2) | 302.2 | (2.3) | 127.5 | (1.9) | 813.4 | (3.7) | 181.2 | (3.0) |
| Chinese Taipei | 39.6 | (0.2) | 5.9 | (0.2) | 242.7 | (2.4) | 76.8 | (2.0) | 253.1 | (2.5) | 72.3 | (1.8) | 190.7 | (2.9) | 110.6 | (3.1) | 692.4 | (6.9) | 219.0 | (5.5) |
| Thailand | 35.9 | (0.2) | 5.8 | (0.2) | 205.9 | (3.1) | 85.6 | (1.8) | 138.6 | (1.7) | 48.4 | (1.1) | 262.4 | (5.4) | 180.0 | (4.6) | 609.0 | (7.9) | 240.1 | (5.1) |
| Tunisia | 26.3 | (0.3) | 12.3 | (0.6) | 275.9 | (4.0) | 140.8 | (10.0) | 305.8 | (4.3) | 156.9 | (7.5) | 179.9 | (3.7) | 140.2 | (7.5) | 739.7 | (9.2) | 286.6 | (9.8) |
| United Arab Emirates | 27.5 | (0.2) | 13.8 | (0.1) | 311.0 | (3.2) | 144.9 | (5.2) | 269.5 | (2.1) | 101.1 | (2.7) | 306.5 | (3.8) | 209.3 | (7.2) | 886.3 | (6.6) | 326.8 | (7.8) |
| Uruguay | 21.3 | (0.6) | 16.7 | (0.7) | 155.8 | (1.9) | 63.1 | (1.5) | 137.9 | (1.7) | 56.9 | (1.1) | 152.5 | (3.6) | 109.5 | (3.3) | 443.9 | (6.6) | 187.6 | (3.9) |
| Viet Nam | 30.9 | (0.3) | 5.0 | (0.3) | 226.6 | (3.3) | 81.8 | (3.5) | 193.1 | (3.0) | 69.2 | (3.2) | 238.3 | (6.5) | 153.2 | (3.5) | 650.2 | (9.4) | 199.2 | (6.0) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Students' learning time in school, by school features
Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Total class periods in a normal full week of school (class periods) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarterof ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 25.2 | (0.4) | 26.0 | (0.3) | 26.7 | (0.3) | 28.0 | (0.2) | 24.0 | (0.4) | 26.5 | (0.3) | 28.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | 31.7 | (0.6) | 34.0 | (0.3) | 33.7 | (0.5) | 33.6 | (0.3) | 32.7 | (0.7) | 33.5 | (0.6) | 33.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Belgium | 31.3 | (0.3) | 31.7 | (0.2) | 31.9 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.2) | 30.8 | (0.4) | 32.0 | (0.2) | 32.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 18.9 | (0.2) | 19.2 | (0.3) | 19.6 | (0.2) | 19.9 | (0.3) | 18.7 | (0.5) | 19.5 | (0.2) | 19.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Chile | 27.8 | (0.8) | 30.2 | (0.8) | 30.0 | (0.7) | 32.6 | (0.7) | 27.9 | (0.9) | 30.4 | (1.0) | 32.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 32.5 | (0.2) | 32.5 | (0.2) | 32.6 | (0.1) | 32.9 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.3) | 32.4 | (0.1) | 33.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Denmark | 28.9 | (0.4) | 28.8 | (0.3) | 29.4 | (0.3) | 29.8 | (0.3) | 29.1 | (0.6) | 28.9 | (0.3) | 30.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Estonia | 32.3 | (0.3) | 32.9 | (0.2) | 32.6 | (0.2) | 33.4 | (0.2) | 32.4 | (0.4) | 32.7 | (0.1) | 33.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Finland | 29.6 | (0.3) | 29.4 | (0.3) | 29.0 | (0.3) | 29.2 | (0.3) | 30.1 | (0.2) | 29.2 | (0.3) | 28.9 | (0.5) |
|  | France | 21.2 | (0.5) | 22.4 | (0.5) | 24.1 | (0.4) | 25.4 | (0.5) | 21.3 | (0.7) | 22.7 | (0.5) | 25.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Germany | 32.2 | (0.2) | 32.3 | (0.2) | 33.1 | (0.2) | 33.7 | (0.2) | 32.3 | (0.2) | 32.2 | (0.2) | 34.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Greece | 32.8 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.1) | 32.5 | (0.0) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 33.3 | (0.2) | 32.3 | (0.0) | 32.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Hungary | 30.7 | (0.2) | 31.1 | (0.2) | 31.5 | (0.2) | 32.0 | (0.2) | 30.5 | (0.3) | 31.2 | (0.3) | 32.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Iceland | 33.3 | (0.4) | 33.8 | (0.4) | 33.8 | (0.4) | 34.4 | (0.3) | 33.3 | (0.4) | 33.4 | (0.3) | 34.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 41.7 | (0.3) | 42.7 | (0.3) | 42.9 | (0.3) | 42.9 | (0.3) | 41.3 | (0.6) | 43.1 | (0.2) | 42.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Israel | 33.7 | (0.6) | 34.8 | (0.7) | 36.0 | (0.8) | 36.5 | (0.6) | 33.0 | (0.6) | 35.2 | (0.9) | 36.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Italy | 30.9 | (0.1) | 30.5 | (0.1) | 30.0 | (0.1) | 29.2 | (0.1) | 31.7 | (0.1) | 30.4 | (0.1) | 28.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 31.0 | (0.3) | 31.9 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.2) | 32.7 | (0.3) | 30.2 | (0.4) | 32.4 | (0.3) | 32.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Korea | 33.9 | (0.4) | 34.6 | (0.4) | 34.9 | (0.4) | 36.4 | (0.4) | 32.5 | (0.4) | 35.8 | (0.4) | 35.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Luxembourg | 26.1 | (0.3) | 27.3 | (0.3) | 28.2 | (0.2) | 28.6 | (0.2) | 26.5 | (0.2) | 28.6 | (0.3) | 28.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 20.9 | (0.3) | 23.7 | (0.3) | 23.9 | (0.3) | 25.8 | (0.4) | 21.4 | (0.4) | 23.6 | (0.3) | 26.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 30.2 | (0.4) | 30.7 | (0.5) | 31.1 | (0.3) | 31.4 | (0.4) | 29.7 | (0.8) | 31.0 | (0.4) | 31.5 | (0.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 22.6 | (0.4) | 24.4 | (0.4) | 24.9 | (0.4) | 26.0 | (0.3) | 21.9 | (0.6) | 24.4 | (0.3) | 27.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Norway | 26.8 | (0.5) | 28.0 | (0.5) | 27.6 | (0.5) | 27.4 | (0.4) | 28.3 | (0.6) | 27.4 | (0.3) | 27.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Poland | 33.5 | (0.1) | 33.5 | (0.1) | 33.3 | (0.1) | 33.6 | (0.2) | 33.8 | (0.2) | 33.1 | (0.2) | 33.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Portugal | 24.7 | (0.6) | 24.8 | (0.5) | 24.9 | (0.5) | 23.6 | (0.8) | 26.7 | (0.7) | 23.6 | (0.6) | 23.3 | (1.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 31.6 | (0.2) | 31.8 | (0.2) | 31.9 | (0.2) | 31.7 | (0.2) | 31.9 | (0.3) | 31.4 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Slovenia | 30.6 | (0.4) | 31.9 | (0.4) | 32.9 | (0.4) | 32.7 | (0.3) | 30.7 | (0.3) | 32.3 | (0.3) | 33.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 30.6 | (0.1) | 30.8 | (0.0) | 30.9 | (0.1) | 31.1 | (0.1) | 30.6 | (0.1) | 30.7 | (0.1) | 31.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Sweden | 23.9 | (0.4) | 23.7 | (0.4) | 24.1 | (0.4) | 24.4 | (0.3) | 24.0 | (0.6) | 24.4 | (0.4) | 23.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 31.7 | (0.5) | 31.4 | (0.3) | 31.6 | (0.5) | 33.6 | (0.4) | 31.9 | (0.9) | 31.7 | (0.6) | 33.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Turkey | 34.0 | (0.3) | 34.6 | (0.3) | 34.8 | (0.3) | 35.4 | (0.3) | 33.5 | (0.4) | 35.1 | (0.3) | 35.3 | (0.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 26.5 | (0.4) | 26.8 | (0.5) | 27.3 | (0.4) | 28.3 | (0.4) | 25.8 | (0.8) | 27.1 | (0.4) | 28.9 | (0.6) |
|  | United States | 16.4 | (0.7) | 18.9 | (0.6) | 20.7 | (0.8) | 23.0 | (0.6) | 15.5 | (0.7) | 20.1 | (0.7) | 22.8 | (0.8) |
|  | OECD average | 29.1 | (0.1) | 29.8 | (0.1) | 30.1 | (0.1) | 30.7 | (0.1) | 29.1 | (0.1) | 30.0 | (0.1) | 30.7 | (0.1) |


| $\because$ Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 12.5 | (0.4) | 13.3 | (0.5) | 14.8 | (0.5) | 16.1 | (0.5) | 11.8 | (0.4) | 13.7 | (0.5) | 16.9 | (0.5) |
| ๕ Brazil | 20.0 | (0.4) | 20.2 | (0.3) | 22.2 | (0.4) | 24.2 | (0.5) | 19.7 | (0.4) | 20.7 | (0.3) | 25.1 | (0.5) |
| Bulgaria | 28.9 | (0.4) | 30.6 | (0.4) | 30.8 | (0.4) | 32.4 | (0.3) | 28.3 | (0.3) | 30.8 | (0.3) | 32.8 | (0.3) |
| Colombia | 22.3 | (0.6) | 22.0 | (0.6) | 22.1 | (0.6) | 23.9 | (0.8) | 22.4 | (0.4) | 21.9 | (0.6) | 23.8 | (0.8) |
| Costa Rica | 38.8 | (1.5) | 41.8 | (1.1) | 41.8 | (1.0) | 43.7 | (1.0) | 39.4 | (1.8) | 41.2 | (1.2) | 44.5 | (1.2) |
| Croatia | 31.5 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.2) | 32.6 | (0.2) | 33.1 | (0.1) | 31.6 | (0.3) | 32.3 | (0.2) | 33.4 | (0.1) |
| Cyprus* | 35.3 | (0.0) | 35.5 | (0.1) | 35.5 | (0.1) | 35.9 | (0.1) | 35.3 | (0.0) | 35.2 | (0.0) | 36.2 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 40.1 | (0.6) | 40.4 | (0.5) | 41.0 | (0.4) | 41.4 | (0.5) | 40.6 | (0.8) | 40.3 | (0.6) | 41.6 | (0.6) |
| Indonesia | 17.8 | (1.0) | 17.4 | (1.2) | 17.0 | (1.1) | 18.8 | (0.9) | 18.0 | (1.0) | 15.9 | (1.0) | 20.0 | (1.4) |
| Jordan | 26.7 | (0.5) | 25.2 | (0.5) | 27.6 | (0.5) | 29.4 | (0.5) | 27.0 | (0.6) | 26.2 | (0.3) | 30.2 | (0.5) |
| Kazakhstan | 29.8 | (0.5) | 30.4 | (0.5) | 31.5 | (0.6) | 32.6 | (0.8) | 30.8 | (0.6) | 29.4 | (0.7) | 33.7 | (0.8) |
| Latvia | 35.3 | (0.1) | 35.4 | (0.1) | 35.6 | (0.1) | 35.8 | (0.1) | 35.1 | (0.2) | 35.3 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (0.2) |
| Liechtenstein | 35.8 | (0.9) | 36.4 | (0.5) | 35.7 | (1.5) | 36.4 | (1.3) | C | c | 36.7 | (0.8) | C | C |
| Lithuania | 32.4 | (0.1) | 32.3 | (0.1) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 32.4 | (0.1) | 32.2 | (0.1) | 32.4 | (0.1) | 32.5 | (0.1) |
| Macao-China | 40.5 | (0.1) | 40.8 | (0.1) | 40.6 | (0.1) | 41.5 | (0.1) | 40.3 | (0.1) | 41.2 | (0.1) | 41.5 | (0.1) |
| Malaysia | 28.5 | (1.0) | 28.7 | (0.9) | 32.5 | (0.9) | 33.2 | (1.0) | 27.7 | (1.3) | 29.3 | (1.0) | 35.5 | (1.5) |
| Montenegro | 25.5 | (0.4) | 26.4 | (0.4) | 27.6 | (0.4) | 28.3 | (0.4) | 25.3 | (0.3) | 26.1 | (0.4) | 28.9 | (0.3) |
| Peru | 23.0 | (0.7) | 23.7 | (0.6) | 25.3 | (0.7) | 28.0 | (0.8) | 22.9 | (0.7) | 23.1 | (0.7) | 28.2 | (0.6) |
| Qatar | 20.3 | (0.4) | 22.9 | (0.5) | 22.9 | (0.4) | 22.1 | (0.3) | 22.6 | (0.4) | 20.7 | (0.4) | 22.2 | (0.2) |
| Romania | 31.7 | (0.2) | 31.4 | (0.2) | 31.2 | (0.1) | 31.5 | (0.2) | 31.7 | (0.2) | 31.4 | (0.1) | 31.4 | (0.2) |
| Russian Federation | 35.1 | (0.2) | 34.9 | (0.1) | 35.3 | (0.2) | 35.6 | (0.2) | 35.3 | (0.2) | 34.8 | (0.2) | 35.9 | (0.2) |
| Serbia | 30.0 | (0.4) | 31.0 | (0.3) | 30.9 | (0.3) | 31.6 | (0.3) | 29.9 | (0.4) | 31.2 | (0.3) | 31.5 | (0.2) |
| Shanghai-China | 39.4 | (0.5) | 40.7 | (0.4) | 42.3 | (0.4) | 42.7 | (0.3) | 37.2 | (0.6) | 42.5 | (0.6) | 43.5 | (0.4) |
| Singapore | 45.0 | (0.4) | 45.4 | (0.4) | 45.7 | (0.5) | 46.3 | (0.8) | 46.1 | (0.2) | 43.9 | (0.3) | 48.1 | (1.0) |
| Chinese Taipei | 38.2 | (0.3) | 39.2 | (0.3) | 40.2 | (0.2) | 41.0 | (0.3) | 38.2 | (0.4) | 39.7 | (0.3) | 41.0 | (0.3) |
| Thailand | 34.7 | (0.2) | 35.7 | (0.3) | 36.2 | (0.3) | 37.0 | (0.3) | 34.4 | (0.4) | 36.1 | (0.4) | 37.6 | (0.5) |
| Tunisia | 25.3 | (0.7) | 25.7 | (0.7) | 27.2 | (0.7) | 27.2 | (0.6) | 23.8 | (0.7) | 26.9 | (0.6) | 27.9 | (0.6) |
| United Arab Emirates | 25.6 | (0.6) | 27.6 | (0.4) | 28.4 | (0.5) | 28.5 | (0.4) | 26.2 | (0.6) | 27.9 | (0.4) | 27.9 | (0.4) |
| Uruguay | 17.5 | (0.8) | 19.2 | (0.8) | 20.7 | (0.8) | 27.6 | (1.3) | 17.5 | (0.8) | 19.8 | (0.7) | 29.0 | (1.5) |
| Viet Nam | 30.4 | (0.3) | 30.6 | (0.2) | 31.1 | (0.3) | 31.4 | (0.6) | 30.2 | (0.2) | 30.7 | (0.4) | 32.0 | (0.9) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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[Part 2/10]
Students' learning time in school, by school features

|  |  | Total class periods in a normal full week of school (class periods) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town (3 000 to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 24.7 | (0.2) | 28.9 | (0.3) | 26.9 | (0.2) | 24.9 | (0.3) | 25.8 | (0.8) | 26.3 | (0.4) | 26.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Austria | 33.1 | (0.3) | 34.6 | (1.2) | 28.6 | (1.5) | 33.4 | (0.3) | 34.7 | (1.1) | 33.7 | (0.4) | 32.0 | (0.5) |
| - | Belgium | 31.6 | (0.3) | 31.9 | (0.2) | 26.3 | (0.7) | 32.1 | (0.1) | 28.3 | (1.3) | 32.0 | (0.1) | 31.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Canada | 19.1 | (0.1) | 22.1 | (0.6) | 21.5 | (0.3) | 19.1 | (0.2) | 21.1 | (0.4) | 20.1 | (0.2) | 18.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Chile | 27.3 | (1.0) | 31.6 | (0.5) | 18.3 | (1.6) | 30.7 | (0.4) | 25.3 | (2.0) | 30.5 | (0.8) | 30.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 32.6 | (0.1) | 33.0 | (0.4) | 32.1 | (0.1) | 33.3 | (0.2) | 32.0 | (0.4) | 32.7 | (0.1) | 32.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 29.2 | (0.2) | 28.8 | (0.7) | 29.2 | (0.2) | C | c | 27.8 | (0.7) | 29.5 | (0.3) | 29.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Estonia | 32.8 | (0.1) | 32.4 | (1.3) | 32.7 | (0.1) | 35.8 | (0.6) | 32.2 | (0.3) | 32.9 | (0.2) | 33.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Finland | 29.4 | (0.2) | 26.7 | (1.8) | 29.3 | (0.2) | c | c | 30.4 | (0.3) | 29.3 | (0.3) | 29.0 | (0.3) |
|  | France | 23.0 | (0.3) | 24.4 | (0.6) | 21.0 | (0.6) | 24.1 | (0.3) | 23.0 | (0.8) | 23.1 | (0.3) | 23.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Germany | 32.7 | (0.1) | 33.8 | (1.1) | 32.9 | (0.1) | 33.0 | (0.7) | c | c | 32.5 | (0.2) | 33.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Greece | 32.5 | (0.0) | C | c | 34.5 | (0.1) | 32.5 | (0.0) | 32.5 | (0.2) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Hungary | 31.2 | (0.2) | 32.3 | (0.4) | 28.9 | (0.3) | 31.6 | (0.2) | 28.3 | (0.9) | 31.1 | (0.2) | 31.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Iceland | 33.8 | (0.2) | c | C | 33.8 | (0.2) | C | C | 33.0 | (0.4) | 33.9 | (0.3) | 34.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 42.7 | (0.3) | 42.6 | (0.2) | 42.5 | (0.2) | 42.6 | (0.3) | 43.0 | (0.3) | 43.1 | (0.2) | 41.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Israel | 35.2 | (0.5) | c | c | 32.5 | (0.9) | 35.6 | (0.5) | 33.9 | (1.1) | 34.9 | (0.7) | 36.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Italy | 30.1 | (0.1) | 30.6 | (0.4) | 30.9 | (0.3) | 30.1 | (0.1) | 32.0 | (0.4) | 30.0 | (0.1) | 30.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 31.1 | (0.2) | 33.8 | (0.4) | c | c | 31.9 | (0.2) | c | C | 31.5 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Korea | 34.3 | (0.4) | 35.8 | (0.4) | 30.3 | (0.5) | 35.2 | (0.3) | c | C | 36.3 | (0.7) | 34.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 27.7 | (0.1) | 26.9 | (0.4) | 26.6 | (0.2) | 28.8 | (0.1) | c | c | 27.5 | (0.1) | C | c |
|  | Mexico | 23.1 | (0.2) | 26.8 | (0.9) | 22.3 | (0.4) | 24.3 | (0.2) | 18.5 | (0.5) | 24.5 | (0.3) | 24.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 30.8 | (0.6) | 30.9 | (0.4) | 30.9 | (0.4) | 30.8 | (0.4) | c | c | 30.8 | (0.3) | 31.1 | (0.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 24.2 | (0.2) | 27.8 | (1.4) | 23.5 | (0.7) | 24.5 | (0.2) | 22.5 | (1.0) | 23.8 | (0.3) | 25.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Norway | 27.4 | (0.3) | C | c | 27.4 | (0.3) | c | c | 27.5 | (0.9) | 27.4 | (0.3) | 27.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Poland | 33.4 | (0.1) | 35.8 | (0.6) | 33.5 | (0.1) | C | c | 33.7 | (0.2) | 33.3 | (0.2) | 33.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 24.6 | (0.5) | 23.7 | (1.6) | 26.3 | (0.4) | 23.2 | (0.6) | 27.3 | (1.6) | 24.6 | (0.5) | 23.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 31.7 | (0.1) | 32.2 | (0.5) | 30.4 | (0.1) | 32.7 | (0.1) | 30.1 | (0.4) | 31.9 | (0.1) | 32.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Slovenia | 32.1 | (0.1) | 32.1 | (1.0) | 24.8 | (1.5) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 25.9 | (2.7) | 32.3 | (0.2) | 32.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 30.6 | (0.0) | 31.4 | (0.1) | 30.9 | (0.0) | c | c | 30.7 | (0.1) | 30.8 | (0.1) | 30.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Sweden | 24.8 | (0.3) | 19.8 | (1.1) | 24.2 | (0.3) | 17.6 | (0.8) | 24.4 | (0.6) | 24.0 | (0.4) | 23.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 32.1 | (0.3) | 31.0 | (2.3) | 33.6 | (0.2) | 27.4 | (0.6) | 31.9 | (1.0) | 32.4 | (0.4) | 30.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 34.6 | (0.2) | C | c | 30.6 | (0.4) | 34.8 | (0.2) | 33.7 | (0.8) | 34.8 | (0.4) | 34.6 | (0.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 27.3 | (0.3) | 27.5 | (0.7) | c | c | 27.2 | (0.3) | 26.8 | (1.1) | 27.6 | (0.5) | 27.0 | (0.7) |
|  | United States | 19.6 | (0.4) | 23.2 | (2.1) | 14.0 | (0.9) | 20.5 | (0.4) | 22.0 | (2.0) | 20.2 | (0.6) | 18.5 | (0.7) |
|  | OECD average | 29.7 | (0.1) | 30.1 | (0.2) | 28.5 | (0.1) | 29.7 | (0.1) | 28.9 | (0.2) | 30.1 | (0.1) | 29.9 | (0.1) |


| $\stackrel{n}{む}$ | Albania | 25.3 | (0.3) | 26.9 | (1.1) | 25.6 | (0.4) | 25.5 | (0.4) | 23.9 | (0.7) | 26.2 | (0.3) | 25.7 | (0.4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 13.1 | (0.4) | 16.2 | (0.5) | 12.5 | (0.5) | 15.1 | (0.4) | 14.0 | (1.5) | 13.9 | (0.4) | 14.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Brazil | 20.6 | (0.2) | 25.5 | (0.6) | 18.1 | (0.4) | 22.4 | (0.2) | 20.3 | (1.4) | 20.7 | (0.3) | 22.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Bulgaria | 30.7 | (0.2) | C | c | 25.8 | (1.3) | 30.9 | (0.2) | 27.9 | (1.4) | 30.4 | (0.3) | 31.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Colombia | 22.2 | (0.3) | 25.1 | (1.5) | 21.2 | (0.4) | 23.4 | (0.4) | 22.7 | (0.7) | 23.0 | (0.6) | 22.4 | (0.5) |
|  | Costa Rica | 41.1 | (0.9) | 45.2 | (1.3) | 37.0 | (0.9) | 47.5 | (0.9) | 42.2 | (1.5) | 41.0 | (1.2) | 42.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Croatia | 32.3 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | 32.4 | (0.1) | c | c | 32.1 | (0.2) | 32.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 35.2 | (0.0) | 37.4 | (0.1) | 36.7 | (0.1) | 35.5 | (0.0) | 35.7 | (0.1) | 35.5 | (0.0) | 35.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 39.8 | (1.1) | 40.7 | (0.4) | 40.3 | (0.5) | 40.9 | (0.4) | c | C | C | C | 40.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 18.9 | (0.8) | 16.3 | (1.1) | 17.8 | (0.9) | 17.7 | (0.9) | 15.8 | (1.0) | 18.6 | (0.9) | 19.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Jordan | 26.5 | (0.3) | 30.5 | (0.7) | 27.2 | (0.3) | C | c | 28.0 | (1.0) | 26.4 | (0.4) | 27.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 31.4 | (0.4) | 20.7 | (2.1) | 31.6 | (0.4) | 29.6 | (0.8) | 30.0 | (0.6) | 31.5 | (0.6) | 31.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Latvia | 35.5 | (0.1) | C | C | 35.5 | (0.1) | 36.1 | (0.3) | 35.2 | (0.1) | 35.6 | (0.1) | 35.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 35.9 | (0.6) | C | C | 36.1 | (0.5) | C | c | c | c | 36.2 | (0.5) | C | c |
|  | Lithuania | 32.4 | (0.1) | C | C | 32.4 | (0.1) | c | c | 32.2 | (0.1) | 32.3 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Macao-China | C | C | 40.9 | (0.1) | 40.5 | (0.1) | 41.2 | (0.1) | c | C | C | C | 40.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 30.1 | (0.7) | 49.3 | (3.7) | 33.8 | (2.0) | 30.7 | (0.7) | 26.6 | (2.2) | 30.8 | (1.0) | 32.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Montenegro | 26.9 | (0.2) | C | c | c | c | 26.9 | (0.2) | c | C | 26.8 | (0.2) | 27.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Peru | 24.0 | (0.4) | 27.3 | (1.1) | 20.7 | (0.8) | 26.4 | (0.4) | 22.9 | (0.9) | 24.3 | (0.6) | 26.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Qatar | 19.3 | (0.2) | 25.3 | (0.3) | 19.5 | (0.5) | 22.5 | (0.2) | 18.3 | (0.5) | 21.1 | (0.3) | 23.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Romania | 31.5 | (0.1) | C | C | 31.5 | (0.1) | C | c | 31.8 | (0.3) | 31.5 | (0.1) | 31.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 35.2 | (0.1) | c | c | 35.1 | (0.1) | 35.9 | (0.2) | 34.9 | (0.3) | 35.0 | (0.2) | 35.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Serbia | 30.8 | (0.2) | c | c | C | c | 30.9 | (0.2) | C | c | 30.8 | (0.3) | 31.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 41.2 | (0.3) | 42.4 | (1.2) | 43.7 | (0.5) | 39.5 | (0.3) | c | c | C | C | 41.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Singapore | 46.4 | (0.2) | C | c | 42.9 | (1.1) | 45.7 | (0.2) | c | c | C | c | 45.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 39.5 | (0.2) | 39.9 | (0.4) | 41.1 | (0.3) | 38.9 | (0.2) | C | C | 39.8 | (0.4) | 39.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Thailand | 35.9 | (0.2) | 36.1 | (0.6) | 34.4 | (0.3) | 36.3 | (0.2) | 34.3 | (0.5) | 36.2 | (0.3) | 36.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Tunisia | 26.4 | (0.3) | C | c | 23.7 | (0.6) | 27.6 | (0.4) | 23.6 | (1.4) | 26.4 | (0.4) | 26.7 | (0.6) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 27.9 | (0.4) | 27.3 | (0.4) | 20.6 | (0.6) | 28.6 | (0.2) | 29.8 | (0.7) | 27.4 | (0.5) | 27.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Uruguay | 19.0 | (0.5) | 30.6 | (1.9) | 17.6 | (1.0) | 23.3 | (0.7) | 16.5 | (2.2) | 19.4 | (0.7) | 24.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Viet Nam | 30.7 | (0.2) | 33.4 | (1.9) | 29.2 | (0.4) | 31.0 | (0.3) | 30.9 | (0.3) | 30.2 | (0.5) | 31.6 | (0.8) |
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Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports


| $\because$ Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Argentina | 233.1 | (8.3) | 264.2 | (8.9) | 277.4 | (7.2) | 299.9 | (12.1) | 229.1 | (8.7) | 264.4 | (8.7) | 305.3 | (13.1) |
| ๕ Brazil | 205.9 | (2.7) | 211.5 | (2.8) | 214.0 | (3.1) | 226.7 | (3.0) | 205.9 | (2.6) | 214.8 | (3.5) | 224.7 | (3.2) |
| Bulgaria | 127.7 | (2.6) | 129.9 | (3.1) | 132.9 | (3.8) | 144.4 | (5.8) | 126.5 | (3.3) | 126.4 | (4.4) | 146.5 | (7.0) |
| Colombia | 254.0 | (7.3) | 257.5 | (6.0) | 267.8 | (6.3) | 271.2 | (6.7) | 263.3 | (8.0) | 251.6 | (6.2) | 275.7 | (7.2) |
| Costa Rica | 201.1 | (3.2) | 198.3 | (3.6) | 208.9 | (4.0) | 222.3 | (3.8) | 200.1 | (2.9) | 198.5 | (4.0) | 236.3 | (4.6) |
| Croatia | 134.9 | (2.5) | 140.8 | (2.3) | 147.4 | (3.1) | 165.5 | (3.3) | 133.3 | (2.7) | 141.2 | (3.3) | 177.7 | (4.7) |
| Cyprus* | 187.1 | (1.0) | 187.6 | (1.0) | 189.1 | (1.0) | 192.6 | (1.0) | 188.5 | (0.9) | 186.3 | (0.5) | 193.5 | (0.9) |
| Hong Kong-China | 265.5 | (3.4) | 265.8 | (3.5) | 264.9 | (3.0) | 273.5 | (5.3) | 264.3 | (4.2) | 271.6 | (3.8) | 265.5 | (6.3) |
| Indonesia | 199.2 | (6.7) | 202.3 | (5.5) | 209.0 | (7.9) | 227.1 | (9.9) | 198.4 | (5.3) | 205.4 | (7.8) | 229.6 | (10.1) |
| Jordan | 227.6 | (4.3) | 224.9 | (4.8) | 228.1 | (3.2) | 227.6 | (3.6) | 222.8 | (2.9) | 227.0 | (3.0) | 231.9 | (5.0) |
| Kazakhstan | 168.2 | (3.0) | 174.2 | (3.4) | 182.9 | (5.6) | 204.9 | (9.0) | 164.5 | (3.8) | 170.0 | (2.6) | 213.7 | (11.1) |
| Latvia | 218.5 | (2.5) | 221.8 | (2.3) | 224.5 | (2.6) | 232.5 | (2.0) | 217.7 | (3.6) | 220.4 | (2.2) | 235.3 | (2.5) |
| Liechtenstein | 225.8 | (16.3) | 216.8 | (9.1) | 191.2 | (7.1) | 207.2 | (10.0) | C | c | 229.1 | (6.8) | c | C |
| Lithuania | 169.7 | (1.7) | 171.2 | (2.1) | 171.2 | (1.6) | 175.4 | (2.9) | 168.4 | (2.7) | 170.7 | (1.9) | 177.4 | (3.5) |
| Macao-China | 269.2 | (2.2) | 278.1 | (2.2) | 275.0 | (1.8) | 277.9 | (1.9) | 267.2 | (1.3) | 285.0 | (2.0) | 282.6 | (1.4) |
| Malaysia | 190.3 | (4.4) | 188.0 | (4.4) | 203.9 | (5.9) | 222.8 | (6.9) | 185.4 | (5.4) | 191.3 | (4.8) | 231.3 | (9.4) |
| Montenegro | 131.7 | (1.8) | 137.3 | (2.0) | 146.8 | (2.4) | 153.1 | (1.5) | 127.9 | (1.1) | 138.6 | (1.9) | 158.8 | (1.5) |
| Peru | 282.8 | (8.2) | 269.4 | (7.2) | 290.2 | (10.0) | 305.7 | (8.4) | 267.4 | (6.5) | 276.3 | (7.0) | 313.4 | (8.5) |
| Qatar | 257.8 | (1.5) | 261.8 | (1.7) | 262.2 | (1.5) | 253.0 | (1.6) | 263.7 | (1.4) | 252.1 | (1.4) | 258.4 | (1.0) |
| Romania | 168.5 | (2.3) | 165.2 | (2.5) | 164.9 | (3.2) | 179.2 | (3.9) | 167.5 | (3.0) | 168.8 | (3.4) | 172.1 | (4.4) |
| Russian Federation | 211.7 | (3.3) | 223.0 | (3.3) | 223.3 | (3.6) | 232.4 | (4.0) | 222.3 | (5.1) | 216.7 | (3.6) | 232.8 | (4.8) |
| Serbia | 148.4 | (2.0) | 151.6 | (1.7) | 153.6 | (1.9) | 164.3 | (2.3) | 148.7 | (2.6) | 149.1 | (2.2) | 171.4 | (2.7) |
| Shanghai-China | 263.9 | (5.2) | 264.0 | (4.8) | 274.8 | (5.0) | 274.9 | (4.5) | 245.0 | (9.3) | 281.0 | (6.9) | 278.1 | (6.3) |
| Singapore | 270.0 | (2.8) | 285.1 | (3.0) | 295.9 | (3.4) | 300.2 | (3.4) | 272.3 | (2.0) | 291.3 | (2.3) | 300.7 | (3.4) |
| Chinese Taipei | 213.6 | (3.3) | 236.7 | (3.7) | 250.5 | (3.5) | 270.3 | (4.0) | 204.7 | (6.2) | 242.1 | (5.3) | 283.5 | (4.9) |
| Thailand | 194.3 | (4.2) | 196.4 | (4.0) | 204.1 | (4.6) | 229.7 | (5.8) | 189.7 | (4.7) | 197.2 | (5.1) | 236.0 | (6.5) |
| Tunisia | 261.5 | (6.4) | 273.6 | (8.2) | 283.1 | (8.2) | 285.0 | (7.9) | 262.3 | (6.4) | 277.0 | (7.1) | 288.0 | (7.1) |
| United Arab Emirates | 311.0 | (5.9) | 314.6 | (4.4) | 315.1 | (6.3) | 304.0 | (6.2) | 327.2 | (9.8) | 318.3 | (5.4) | 292.2 | (5.9) |
| Uruguay | 154.7 | (3.0) | 152.6 | (3.3) | 155.7 | (3.2) | 160.0 | (3.4) | 152.9 | (2.9) | 159.6 | (3.5) | 154.4 | (3.9) |
| Viet Nam | 219.5 | (5.1) | 218.5 | (5.1) | 229.3 | (5.1) | 239.0 | (5.3) | 217.8 | (5.0) | 229.0 | (7.5) | 236.6 | (7.1) |

[^23][Part 4/10]
Students' learning time in school, by school features

|  |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town ( $\mathbf{3} 000$ to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 237.8 | (1.4) | 233.6 | (1.6) | 234.4 | (1.0) | 244.4 | (2.6) | 237.1 | (3.6) | 236.6 | (2.1) | 236.1 | (1.2) |
| - | Austria | 158.0 | (2.6) | 139.8 | (6.9) | 191.5 | (4.9) | 155.0 | (2.5) | 143.9 | (8.9) | 157.4 | (3.6) | 158.6 | (5.1) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 218.2 | (2.8) | 214.2 | (2.4) | 246.0 | (7.0) | 214.9 | (1.4) | 213.8 | (13.8) | 215.2 | (2.0) | 220.5 | (4.7) |
|  | Canada | 317.9 | (2.8) | 271.3 | (13.2) | 297.4 | (4.6) | 316.5 | (3.1) | 311.6 | (6.3) | 313.1 | (3.8) | 314.7 | (4.2) |
|  | Chile | 407.8 | (10.0) | 394.9 | (8.2) | 354.1 | (32.6) | 399.3 | (6.4) | 385.1 | (23.1) | 423.3 | (9.0) | 382.0 | (9.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 184.0 | (2.4) | 150.5 | (6.4) | 201.6 | (1.7) | 159.5 | (3.4) | 217.2 | (5.5) | 176.8 | (2.7) | 182.2 | (4.5) |
|  | Denmark | 221.7 | (3.3) | 235.8 | (8.0) | 224.2 | (3.0) | C | c | 233.1 | (10.1) | 222.2 | (2.9) | 225.6 | (4.5) |
|  | Estonia | 222.8 | (1.1) | 224.7 | (4.0) | 223.3 | (1.1) | 195.6 | (12.1) | 223.8 | (2.7) | 223.5 | (1.3) | 220.8 | (2.3) |
|  | Finland | 175.0 | (1.6) | 191.6 | (3.0) | 175.4 | (1.5) | C | C | 169.3 | (4.7) | 174.8 | (2.1) | 178.9 | (2.5) |
|  | France | 206.6 | (2.5) | 207.6 | (4.5) | 202.4 | (4.4) | 208.6 | (2.3) | 198.7 | (6.8) | 208.0 | (2.8) | 207.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Germany | 196.6 | (2.7) | 184.6 | (11.8) | 197.5 | (2.4) | 169.8 | (30.8) | C | c | 195.7 | (3.1) | 196.6 | (5.1) |
|  | Greece | 209.0 | (0.7) | c | c | 173.3 | (3.6) | 210.2 | (0.6) | 208.6 | (2.5) | 208.8 | (1.1) | 209.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Hungary | 149.4 | (1.8) | 151.1 | (5.9) | 167.4 | (3.9) | 147.7 | (2.0) | 156.3 | (8.7) | 150.6 | (2.6) | 148.0 | (2.9) |
|  | Iceland | 243.6 | (1.9) | C | C | 243.9 | (1.9) | C | C | 237.6 | (3.3) | 242.1 | (2.6) | 250.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Ireland | 189.7 | (1.6) | 187.5 | (1.7) | 195.3 | (1.2) | 178.0 | (2.0) | 188.4 | (2.1) | 189.0 | (1.8) | 188.7 | (2.0) |
|  | Israel | 254.9 | (2.4) | c | c | 260.5 | (6.4) | 253.2 | (2.6) | 242.7 | (5.6) | 256.8 | (3.7) | 257.6 | (4.4) |
|  | Italy | 232.9 | (1.8) | 218.5 | (6.7) | 289.8 | (6.0) | 231.1 | (1.8) | 219.4 | (8.4) | 233.0 | (2.1) | 231.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Japan | 226.3 | (3.1) | 254.6 | (7.9) | C | C | 234.7 | (3.0) | c | C | 217.3 | (6.3) | 241.3 | (4.2) |
|  | Korea | 211.9 | (4.0) | 215.2 | (5.3) | 163.5 | (5.1) | 216.4 | (3.3) | C | C | 209.7 | (6.1) | 214.0 | (3.6) |
|  | Luxembourg | 204.2 | (0.9) | 207.6 | (2.4) | 216.9 | (1.0) | 187.4 | (1.3) | c | C | 204.8 | (0.8) | c | c |
|  | Mexico | 252.9 | (1.6) | 260.9 | (6.9) | 250.3 | (2.6) | 254.9 | (2.2) | 253.6 | (3.9) | 256.4 | (2.7) | 250.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 169.2 | (4.1) | 172.3 | (5.1) | 175.0 | (4.1) | 161.4 | (3.0) | c | c | 168.0 | (3.2) | 179.9 | (9.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 239.9 | (2.1) | 256.1 | (12.6) | 215.6 | (3.5) | 242.5 | (2.1) | 240.6 | (8.4) | 235.6 | (2.5) | 243.7 | (3.0) |
|  | Norway | 199.5 | (2.5) | c | c | 199.1 | (2.4) | c | C | 196.4 | (5.1) | 198.4 | (3.7) | 204.8 | (4.8) |
|  | Poland | 197.2 | (1.7) | 220.9 | (3.6) | 198.2 | (1.7) | c | C | 192.1 | (3.3) | 195.4 | (2.4) | 212.2 | (3.8) |
|  | Portugal | 287.9 | (5.4) | 286.6 | (11.2) | 290.5 | (5.7) | 286.0 | (7.3) | 330.7 | (39.6) | 286.8 | (4.6) | 278.6 | (10.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 182.4 | (2.8) | 164.4 | (16.2) | 230.1 | (1.7) | 141.7 | (3.5) | 230.1 | (2.9) | 174.2 | (3.9) | 168.3 | (9.1) |
|  | Slovenia | 160.2 | (0.5) | 178.3 | (0.7) | 176.3 | (1.8) | 159.3 | (0.5) | 175.6 | (1.7) | 161.7 | (0.5) | 158.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | 208.7 | (1.0) | 212.8 | (1.8) | 210.3 | (0.9) | C | C | 202.2 | (6.0) | 209.2 | (1.5) | 212.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | 182.3 | (1.9) | 181.6 | (11.7) | 180.9 | (2.1) | 239.5 | (20.8) | 180.0 | (2.7) | 181.5 | (3.3) | 185.2 | (4.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 207.7 | (2.7) | 203.0 | (14.5) | 220.9 | (2.2) | 161.5 | (6.9) | 217.4 | (9.3) | 210.7 | (3.0) | 188.5 | (8.1) |
|  | Turkey | 171.0 | (2.2) | c | c | 170.1 | (8.4) | 171.9 | (2.2) | 189.7 | (8.3) | 175.1 | (5.0) | 168.3 | (4.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 228.7 | (2.6) | 230.6 | (4.3) | c | c | 230.0 | (2.2) | 239.9 | (6.6) | 225.6 | (2.7) | 235.7 | (5.6) |
|  | United States | 255.4 | (5.2) | 245.1 | (21.4) | 239.4 | (11.2) | 255.9 | (4.9) | 228.1 | (6.1) | 266.7 | (6.8) | 245.2 | (7.7) |
|  | OECD average | 218.0 | (0.5) | 217.1 | (1.5) | 219.2 | (1.2) | 215.3 | (1.5) | 222.9 | (1.8) | 217.8 | (0.6) | 218.0 | (0.9) |


| 气 | Albania | 171.0 | (1.3) | 165.2 | (5.8) | 175.3 | (1.8) | 167.5 | (1.4) | 170.2 | (3.0) | 173.3 | (1.7) | 166.9 | (2.6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 246.1 | (6.3) | 306.9 | (12.2) | 240.1 | (6.9) | 280.4 | (7.6) | 246.7 | (19.8) | 264.9 | (9.3) | 275.5 | (8.4) |
|  | Brazil | 211.3 | (1.8) | 230.5 | (4.2) | 227.9 | (3.5) | 212.0 | (2.0) | 207.3 | (7.0) | 207.6 | (2.3) | 221.6 | (2.5) |
|  | Bulgaria | 133.6 | (3.1) | C | c | 180.5 | (7.7) | 132.4 | (3.1) | 153.1 | (9.2) | 135.8 | (3.9) | 129.0 | (5.2) |
|  | Colombia | 257.6 | (4.0) | 286.2 | (10.7) | 266.7 | (5.9) | 260.2 | (5.0) | 276.2 | (13.5) | 242.7 | (6.2) | 270.8 | (5.6) |
|  | Costa Rica | 200.6 | (2.5) | 246.0 | (7.1) | 216.7 | (1.8) | 195.0 | (5.1) | 210.3 | (3.3) | 205.6 | (3.8) | 212.6 | (8.9) |
|  | Croatia | 146.7 | (2.1) | C | c | C | c | 147.1 | (2.1) | C | c | 143.1 | (2.1) | 153.9 | (4.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 186.4 | (0.5) | 206.2 | (1.5) | 195.0 | (2.7) | 188.9 | (0.4) | 193.2 | (1.9) | 185.9 | (0.5) | 194.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 260.9 | (7.0) | 267.6 | (2.8) | 258.8 | (3.4) | 271.9 | (2.8) | C | c | C | C | 267.6 | (2.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 210.8 | (5.5) | 209.2 | (7.5) | 212.3 | (6.2) | 206.7 | (6.4) | 198.1 | (9.9) | 212.9 | (5.9) | 216.0 | (8.6) |
|  | Jordan | 226.7 | (2.1) | 229.3 | (5.3) | 227.1 | (2.0) | c | c | 232.0 | (4.4) | 226.9 | (2.5) | 226.2 | (3.8) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 182.4 | (4.2) | 186.6 | (16.5) | 181.4 | (3.8) | 185.4 | (7.5) | 162.7 | (2.7) | 178.2 | (3.4) | 200.7 | (9.5) |
|  | Latvia | 224.5 | (1.6) | c | c | 224.6 | (1.5) | 219.8 | (12.7) | 216.1 | (2.6) | 228.0 | (2.4) | 226.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 215.3 | (3.8) | c | c | 217.1 | (4.8) | C | c | c | c | 210.7 | (4.5) | c | C |
|  | Lithuania | 171.1 | (1.4) | C | C | 171.8 | (1.5) | C | C | 168.7 | (2.6) | 172.1 | (2.4) | 173.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Macao-China | C | c | 276.1 | (0.9) | 267.7 | (1.2) | 283.9 | (1.3) | c | c | C | C | 275.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Malaysia | 198.5 | (3.3) | 273.0 | (39.7) | 187.9 | (9.4) | 201.7 | (3.7) | 191.6 | (10.0) | 199.4 | (4.4) | 209.7 | (9.5) |
|  | Montenegro | 142.0 | (0.8) | c | c | C | c | 142.1 | (0.8) | C | C | 145.7 | (1.1) | 134.1 | (1.2) |
|  | Peru | 272.3 | (4.4) | 351.1 | (13.7) | 263.0 | (8.5) | 294.8 | (4.8) | 280.1 | (8.0) | 288.8 | (6.6) | 288.2 | (6.8) |
|  | Qatar | 253.7 | (0.9) | 266.1 | (1.3) | 266.5 | (2.1) | 257.1 | (0.8) | 261.5 | (2.6) | 252.6 | (1.1) | 263.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Romania | 169.4 | (1.9) | C | c | 169.4 | (1.9) | c | c | 186.0 | (7.0) | 165.9 | (3.0) | 171.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 221.9 | (2.4) | C | C | 218.2 | (2.6) | 242.7 | (5.2) | 206.7 | (5.3) | 222.9 | (4.3) | 229.0 | (3.8) |
|  | Serbia | 153.6 | (1.3) | C | C | c | c | 153.9 | (1.1) | C | C | 153.2 | (1.8) | 154.2 | (2.8) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 267.2 | (3.3) | 291.1 | (17.2) | 331.3 | (3.7) | 222.4 | (3.6) | c | C | c | C | 269.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Singapore | 287.5 | (1.1) | C | C | 203.4 | (3.9) | 289.8 | (1.3) | c | C | c | c | 288.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 253.4 | (2.5) | 224.4 | (6.3) | 266.8 | (3.3) | 229.5 | (3.1) | C | c | 245.7 | (6.3) | 241.0 | (4.4) |
|  | Thailand | 210.4 | (2.9) | 182.1 | (11.9) | 201.3 | (4.1) | 207.1 | (3.5) | 216.4 | (5.6) | 196.4 | (4.5) | 216.1 | (7.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 276.2 | (4.0) | C | c | 246.2 | (5.0) | 291.4 | (5.2) | 294.3 | (31.1) | 275.6 | (4.8) | 273.3 | (7.2) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 351.4 | (5.6) | 283.6 | (4.5) | 246.5 | (4.6) | 320.4 | (3.5) | 325.2 | (14.7) | 336.4 | (8.4) | 296.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 155.7 | (2.1) | 156.0 | (5.0) | 160.0 | (3.1) | 153.4 | (2.5) | 148.0 | (5.9) | 154.3 | (3.2) | 159.2 | (2.9) |
|  | Viet Nam | 223.2 | (3.4) | 268.8 | (17.9) | 213.3 | (8.3) | 228.0 | (3.7) | 220.8 | (6.1) | 223.4 | (6.5) | 241.2 | (7.3) |
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Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in the language of instruction (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 233.6 | (1.5) | 232.7 | (1.8) | 234.6 | (1.5) | 232.7 | (1.7) | 234.0 | (2.3) | 234.4 | (1.3) | 230.6 | (2.0) |
| A Austria | 144.6 | (3.1) | 141.6 | (3.3) | 143.3 | (2.5) | 147.3 | (1.9) | 149.2 | (4.2) | 134.9 | (3.3) | 153.2 | (2.4) |
| Belgium | 215.6 | (2.9) | 215.9 | (2.2) | 219.7 | (1.8) | 220.3 | (2.0) | 209.1 | (3.6) | 216.8 | (2.8) | 223.8 | (2.0) |
| Canada | 317.6 | (4.8) | 309.0 | (4.2) | 317.9 | (4.4) | 319.5 | (4.4) | 302.8 | (7.7) | 324.6 | (3.6) | 308.8 | (6.4) |
| Chile | 376.7 | (9.4) | 379.4 | (7.9) | 390.3 | (10.1) | 351.6 | (7.9) | 378.9 | (7.6) | 375.4 | (11.9) | 368.8 | (10.6) |
| Czech Republic | 181.5 | (2.0) | 178.2 | (2.5) | 177.5 | (2.0) | 178.9 | (2.2) | 173.6 | (4.5) | 184.2 | (2.4) | 170.2 | (2.9) |
| Denmark | 318.5 | (7.6) | 304.8 | (4.9) | 323.1 | (6.0) | 311.4 | (5.3) | 311.2 | (5.4) | 318.7 | (6.0) | 307.4 | (6.4) |
| Estonia | 197.6 | (2.3) | 198.7 | (1.8) | 197.5 | (1.9) | 199.5 | (1.4) | 195.8 | (3.6) | 198.7 | (1.7) | 199.2 | (1.7) |
| Finland | 149.6 | (1.5) | 152.0 | (1.9) | 152.7 | (1.7) | 154.3 | (1.6) | 150.8 | (3.3) | 152.3 | (1.8) | 152.6 | (2.4) |
| France | 212.0 | (4.1) | 210.8 | (4.1) | 215.9 | (3.7) | 220.1 | (3.5) | 216.4 | (5.2) | 209.7 | (3.2) | 220.6 | (2.9) |
| Germany | 201.1 | (4.2) | 194.3 | (3.2) | 186.8 | (3.3) | 181.0 | (3.0) | 207.8 | (4.9) | 188.6 | (2.9) | 180.8 | (4.5) |
| Greece | 167.0 | (1.1) | 170.8 | (1.1) | 171.2 | (1.2) | 172.9 | (1.0) | 166.5 | (1.5) | 170.8 | (0.8) | 172.1 | (1.1) |
| Hungary | 159.5 | (2.6) | 164.0 | (2.3) | 166.9 | (2.7) | 166.3 | (2.2) | 155.4 | (3.2) | 168.8 | (2.9) | 167.0 | (2.4) |
| Iceland | 239.9 | (4.5) | 236.2 | (3.9) | 238.7 | (3.6) | 238.6 | (3.7) | 251.9 | (5.9) | 235.6 | (2.6) | 234.6 | (3.2) |
| Ireland | 182.1 | (1.6) | 182.3 | (1.4) | 179.9 | (1.9) | 178.1 | (1.7) | 182.2 | (2.9) | 181.3 | (1.5) | 178.4 | (2.5) |
| Israel | 195.5 | (4.3) | 191.5 | (3.7) | 190.2 | (5.5) | 191.9 | (4.3) | 199.6 | (4.3) | 189.0 | (4.8) | 190.7 | (5.2) |
| Italy | 285.9 | (2.0) | 281.6 | (2.2) | 274.6 | (2.1) | 267.5 | (2.3) | 290.3 | (2.4) | 281.2 | (2.4) | 261.2 | (2.9) |
| Japan | 189.2 | (3.3) | 201.6 | (3.1) | 209.2 | (2.7) | 220.0 | (2.9) | 172.4 | (4.1) | 205.9 | (3.7) | 236.0 | (4.1) |
| Korea | 195.6 | (3.4) | 203.0 | (3.3) | 202.7 | (2.9) | 214.1 | (4.9) | 177.9 | (5.0) | 211.8 | (3.3) | 215.4 | (7.7) |
| Luxembourg | 193.6 | (1.7) | 182.1 | (2.1) | 186.1 | (1.8) | 192.0 | (1.8) | 188.4 | (1.3) | 173.0 | (2.4) | 194.4 | (1.2) |
| Mexico | 226.6 | (2.4) | 231.5 | (2.5) | 232.1 | (3.1) | 238.3 | (2.8) | 230.7 | (3.0) | 234.5 | (3.0) | 231.0 | (3.5) |
| Netherlands | 177.0 | (4.3) | 170.7 | (3.5) | 169.5 | (3.2) | 158.1 | (3.5) | 193.7 | (6.0) | 167.2 | (2.5) | 154.2 | (5.0) |
| New Zealand | 243.7 | (4.1) | 241.4 | (2.2) | 240.0 | (2.7) | 246.0 | (2.3) | 246.1 | (4.3) | 240.0 | (2.7) | 245.6 | (3.2) |
| Norway | 222.5 | (5.2) | 215.9 | (3.1) | 214.7 | (3.2) | 218.5 | (3.8) | 233.2 | (8.8) | 215.0 | (2.8) | 222.2 | (4.1) |
| Poland | 216.7 | (2.5) | 218.7 | (2.1) | 220.5 | (1.7) | 223.0 | (1.8) | 216.1 | (3.7) | 218.8 | (2.3) | 226.8 | (2.7) |
| Portugal | 251.6 | (6.2) | 241.6 | (5.0) | 234.3 | (5.2) | 222.9 | (5.0) | 256.2 | (8.3) | 235.2 | (4.7) | 215.6 | (6.9) |
| Slovak Republic | 189.8 | (2.9) | 178.0 | (2.8) | 178.0 | (2.5) | 171.4 | (2.5) | 181.2 | (5.6) | 194.6 | (2.9) | 150.6 | (2.5) |
| Slovenia | 162.1 | (1.0) | 167.4 | (1.0) | 170.8 | (1.2) | 175.4 | (1.0) | 155.8 | (1.0) | 170.6 | (0.7) | 178.6 | (0.3) |
| Spain | 210.5 | (2.2) | 203.7 | (1.5) | 200.0 | (1.3) | 198.7 | (1.8) | 208.3 | (2.7) | 201.4 | (2.2) | 201.1 | (2.8) |
| Sweden | 185.5 | (5.0) | 177.1 | (3.0) | 177.8 | (3.8) | 173.9 | (3.5) | 177.6 | (3.7) | 179.3 | (3.5) | 174.9 | (6.0) |
| Switzerland | 211.1 | (4.0) | 208.2 | (5.3) | 201.2 | (4.8) | 205.1 | (5.1) | 207.0 | (7.1) | 212.0 | (3.9) | 196.9 | (7.0) |
| Turkey | 188.5 | (4.3) | 191.5 | (4.1) | 197.6 | (4.0) | 218.2 | (3.0) | 178.9 | (3.3) | 196.8 | (4.8) | 223.9 | (4.6) |
| United Kingdom | 239.1 | (4.1) | 231.9 | (3.6) | 228.8 | (3.4) | 226.4 | (4.3) | 245.2 | (5.5) | 227.2 | (3.3) | 228.6 | (5.6) |
| United States | 260.8 | (9.2) | 246.9 | (7.9) | 257.9 | (6.1) | 264.7 | (5.6) | 250.8 | (11.2) | 261.8 | (6.7) | 257.6 | (7.6) |
| OECD average | 215.9 | (0.7) | 213.4 | (0.6) | 214.8 | (0.6) | 214.7 | (0.6) | 214.6 | (0.9) | 215.0 | (0.7) | 213.9 | (0.8) |


| A Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 223.8 | (7.7) | 263.0 | (11.2) | 271.2 | (10.3) | 292.0 | (12.3) | 219.9 | (8.2) | 253.1 | (7.6) | 305.4 | (14.9) |
| ๕ Brazil | 207.7 | (2.8) | 210.2 | (2.6) | 208.7 | (3.5) | 204.8 | (3.8) | 206.9 | (2.8) | 212.9 | (3.1) | 201.8 | (4.3) |
| Bulgaria | 144.6 | (2.1) | 141.3 | (2.4) | 137.3 | (2.2) | 137.8 | (2.5) | 143.7 | (3.0) | 142.9 | (3.1) | 135.3 | (2.9) |
| Colombia | 224.3 | (5.6) | 233.3 | (5.3) | 233.9 | (5.6) | 235.3 | (6.7) | 232.9 | (5.5) | 229.3 | (5.8) | 233.3 | (6.4) |
| Costa Rica | 187.2 | (2.2) | 182.8 | (3.0) | 190.2 | (2.9) | 195.4 | (3.1) | 185.0 | (1.9) | 184.2 | (3.0) | 203.8 | (3.7) |
| Croatia | 159.5 | (2.3) | 160.7 | (1.6) | 164.6 | (1.6) | 172.9 | (1.2) | 160.2 | (2.7) | 159.6 | (1.8) | 179.5 | (1.4) |
| Cyprus* | 198.2 | (1.4) | 194.7 | (1.1) | 198.9 | (1.2) | 200.3 | (1.2) | 198.3 | (1.2) | 193.3 | (0.9) | 204.7 | (1.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 280.6 | (3.9) | 282.7 | (3.7) | 279.4 | (4.1) | 275.4 | (4.9) | 281.9 | (4.8) | 285.2 | (4.0) | 268.2 | (5.0) |
| Indonesia | 177.9 | (7.7) | 177.4 | (7.7) | 182.9 | (6.7) | 189.3 | (7.2) | 176.0 | (8.1) | 177.5 | (6.6) | 195.2 | (7.3) |
| Jordan | 264.5 | (3.2) | 265.9 | (4.2) | 265.9 | (4.5) | 263.1 | (6.3) | 267.0 | (3.8) | 264.3 | (2.9) | 264.5 | (8.2) |
| Kazakhstan | 108.1 | (4.2) | 102.9 | (3.2) | 107.8 | (3.6) | 117.0 | (4.9) | 104.8 | (6.6) | 106.5 | (3.5) | 115.5 | (4.8) |
| Latvia | 152.4 | (2.7) | 156.8 | (2.4) | 159.4 | (3.0) | 161.9 | (2.1) | 155.0 | (3.5) | 157.7 | (2.1) | 159.9 | (2.3) |
| Liechtenstein | 220.1 | (10.2) | 192.7 | (7.0) | 170.1 | (6.2) | 186.8 | (7.5) | c | C | 227.7 | (19.0) | c | c |
| Lithuania | 202.2 | (1.9) | 202.7 | (1.8) | 204.6 | (1.8) | 204.4 | (1.8) | 202.7 | (2.3) | 202.1 | (1.8) | 207.1 | (2.7) |
| Macao-China | 262.5 | (1.4) | 266.5 | (1.4) | 265.9 | (1.5) | 265.8 | (1.6) | 261.0 | (0.9) | 274.3 | (1.5) | 267.1 | (1.2) |
| Malaysia | 201.0 | (4.1) | 196.0 | (3.6) | 203.1 | (3.7) | 208.9 | (4.4) | 198.8 | (5.0) | 200.6 | (4.5) | 207.6 | (5.2) |
| Montenegro | 143.1 | (2.0) | 146.0 | (1.8) | 149.9 | (1.3) | 159.6 | (1.6) | 138.7 | (1.5) | 148.4 | (2.0) | 161.4 | (1.0) |
| Peru | 267.7 | (6.8) | 252.5 | (7.7) | 258.3 | (8.1) | 258.6 | (7.1) | 261.1 | (6.6) | 258.6 | (7.9) | 258.3 | (5.1) |
| Qatar | 225.6 | (1.7) | 230.3 | (1.6) | 232.3 | (1.5) | 222.7 | (1.5) | 228.7 | (1.2) | 220.1 | (1.6) | 230.8 | (1.1) |
| Romania | 174.9 | (2.4) | 176.1 | (2.1) | 176.7 | (2.6) | 187.8 | (2.1) | 171.7 | (3.3) | 176.6 | (3.0) | 188.9 | (3.1) |
| Russian Federation | 139.7 | (2.8) | 136.9 | (3.4) | 131.5 | (2.4) | 132.0 | (3.0) | 146.6 | (4.7) | 130.9 | (2.3) | 133.6 | (3.6) |
| Serbia | 140.7 | (1.2) | 142.8 | (1.4) | 143.2 | (2.0) | 154.4 | (2.0) | 138.8 | (1.5) | 139.1 | (1.5) | 164.5 | (3.4) |
| Shanghai-China | 252.0 | (4.8) | 246.7 | (4.2) | 248.7 | (4.2) | 245.0 | (4.1) | 237.2 | (7.6) | 259.2 | (7.1) | 245.4 | (5.6) |
| Singapore | 231.9 | (2.0) | 227.8 | (2.9) | 218.9 | (2.0) | 215.7 | (1.6) | 233.7 | (1.0) | 223.3 | (3.4) | 211.5 | (2.0) |
| Chinese Taipei | 230.4 | (3.5) | 249.9 | (3.9) | 259.1 | (3.3) | 273.2 | (3.9) | 223.3 | (6.3) | 255.4 | (5.1) | 281.1 | (4.9) |
| Thailand | 144.1 | (2.2) | 141.9 | (2.4) | 135.9 | (2.4) | 132.6 | (2.7) | 143.0 | (2.6) | 138.4 | (3.6) | 133.0 | (3.2) |
| Tunisia | 309.7 | (8.9) | 307.6 | (7.9) | 308.8 | (8.0) | 297.3 | (8.4) | 300.3 | (8.4) | 306.4 | (6.0) | 310.6 | (8.1) |
| United Arab Emirates | 274.2 | (3.3) | 267.4 | (3.2) | 268.4 | (3.5) | 268.2 | (3.8) | 287.3 | (4.7) | 262.8 | (3.4) | 264.9 | (4.7) |
| Uruguay | 136.8 | (3.0) | 135.7 | (2.8) | 136.4 | (2.8) | 142.7 | (2.7) | 137.4 | (2.7) | 138.2 | (2.7) | 138.3 | (3.2) |
| Viet Nam | 202.0 | (4.8) | 191.3 | (4.4) | 191.0 | (4.1) | 188.0 | (4.2) | 201.7 | (5.0) | 191.8 | (5.9) | 182.0 | (4.0) |
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|  |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in the language of instruction (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town ( $\mathbf{3} 000$ to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 235.3 | (1.4) | 230.1 | (1.5) | 232.9 | (1.1) | 235.2 | (2.3) | 235.5 | (4.1) | 234.1 | (1.8) | 232.7 | (1.3) |
| - | Austria | 144.4 | (1.8) | 142.8 | (4.6) | 191.3 | (6.2) | 142.4 | (1.8) | 140.5 | (6.1) | 145.0 | (2.7) | 144.3 | (2.6) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 223.9 | (2.7) | 212.5 | (2.2) | 256.4 | (8.4) | 215.2 | (1.4) | 239.9 | (12.8) | 212.7 | (1.9) | 230.0 | (3.5) |
|  | Canada | 320.2 | (2.9) | 273.6 | (13.1) | 329.5 | (6.5) | 313.9 | (3.1) | 308.0 | (6.9) | 314.6 | (3.6) | 318.4 | (4.4) |
|  | Chile | 379.6 | (9.0) | 373.2 | (8.0) | 360.4 | (32.1) | 375.0 | (6.2) | 393.7 | (34.9) | 395.4 | (8.0) | 360.5 | (8.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 181.3 | (1.8) | 148.4 | (5.4) | 197.3 | (2.0) | 157.6 | (2.4) | 205.2 | (5.3) | 176.4 | (2.2) | 176.6 | (3.4) |
|  | Denmark | 315.6 | (4.3) | 313.6 | (10.2) | 314.8 | (4.1) | C | c | 315.5 | (11.6) | 314.1 | (4.2) | 316.5 | (7.1) |
|  | Estonia | 197.8 | (1.2) | 205.1 | (5.8) | 198.5 | (1.2) | 183.7 | (7.8) | 199.8 | (3.2) | 197.9 | (1.5) | 197.4 | (2.0) |
|  | Finland | 151.7 | (1.3) | 171.5 | (4.4) | 152.1 | (1.2) | C | C | 146.4 | (3.7) | 150.7 | (1.8) | 157.8 | (2.0) |
|  | France | 215.3 | (2.4) | 212.8 | (4.3) | 213.8 | (4.2) | 215.1 | (2.1) | 209.6 | (7.2) | 213.0 | (2.6) | 220.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Germany | 192.0 | (2.4) | 180.8 | (10.2) | 191.9 | (2.2) | 149.2 | (14.4) | C | c | 191.6 | (3.0) | 190.5 | (4.5) |
|  | Greece | 170.4 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | 170.8 | (0.6) | 171.3 | (2.2) | 169.7 | (0.7) | 171.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Hungary | 162.5 | (1.6) | 171.8 | (6.0) | 169.6 | (3.9) | 163.5 | (1.8) | 161.1 | (14.2) | 166.1 | (2.2) | 160.9 | (2.9) |
|  | Iceland | 237.6 | (2.0) | c | C | 238.1 | (2.0) | c | c | 232.1 | (4.0) | 236.7 | (2.4) | 242.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Ireland | 181.6 | (1.8) | 180.5 | (1.6) | 186.0 | (1.3) | 171.9 | (1.9) | 181.0 | (2.4) | 181.9 | (1.9) | 178.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Israel | 192.5 | (2.7) | c | c | 172.4 | (6.4) | 195.5 | (2.8) | 188.4 | (9.0) | 196.4 | (4.2) | 189.6 | (4.7) |
|  | Italy | 277.3 | (1.5) | 260.2 | (10.1) | 396.0 | (13.8) | 275.6 | (1.3) | 288.2 | (14.4) | 276.0 | (1.7) | 276.4 | (2.4) |
|  | Japan | 199.4 | (2.7) | 217.9 | (4.2) | C | C | 204.8 | (2.1) | c | c | 189.3 | (4.3) | 210.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Korea | 200.4 | (3.1) | 207.8 | (4.5) | 178.5 | (4.9) | 205.4 | (2.7) | C | C | 204.7 | (5.7) | 204.2 | (2.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 187.3 | (0.9) | 194.3 | (2.1) | 194.8 | (1.2) | 179.5 | (1.3) | c | C | 188.4 | (0.8) | C | C |
|  | Mexico | 232.4 | (1.9) | 233.2 | (4.6) | 238.7 | (2.3) | 228.5 | (2.4) | 222.7 | (3.8) | 233.9 | (2.2) | 233.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 167.0 | (3.1) | 170.4 | (3.6) | 173.7 | (2.8) | 158.3 | (3.1) | C | c | 168.3 | (2.6) | 171.5 | (6.4) |
|  | New Zealand | 241.8 | (1.9) | 257.8 | (13.7) | 216.8 | (4.3) | 244.4 | (2.1) | 241.7 | (7.3) | 237.7 | (2.5) | 245.6 | (2.8) |
|  | Norway | 217.7 | (2.2) | c | c | 218.0 | (2.2) | c | C | 215.2 | (6.2) | 214.7 | (2.8) | 229.5 | (5.3) |
|  | Poland | 219.2 | (1.7) | 234.6 | (4.1) | 219.8 | (1.6) | c | C | 216.2 | (4.2) | 220.7 | (1.6) | 222.5 | (3.0) |
|  | Portugal | 240.6 | (4.2) | 213.1 | (4.7) | 280.4 | (5.6) | 206.9 | (3.8) | 278.3 | (20.3) | 237.5 | (4.4) | 226.7 | (6.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 181.7 | (1.9) | 156.1 | (7.1) | 220.2 | (1.8) | 147.4 | (1.6) | 223.3 | (3.0) | 174.5 | (2.6) | 163.2 | (4.7) |
|  | Slovenia | 168.9 | (0.5) | 178.7 | (0.7) | 174.7 | (3.7) | 168.6 | (0.4) | 180.0 | (0.0) | 169.1 | (0.5) | 168.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Spain | 203.0 | (1.1) | 202.6 | (2.2) | 203.3 | (1.1) | C | C | 197.6 | (2.7) | 201.7 | (1.5) | 205.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Sweden | 179.8 | (2.2) | 172.6 | (15.0) | 179.1 | (3.0) | 163.9 | (7.6) | 185.0 | (5.1) | 179.7 | (4.7) | 172.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 207.4 | (3.0) | 189.3 | (21.0) | 215.5 | (2.9) | 178.0 | (7.0) | 217.7 | (9.9) | 208.5 | (3.8) | 192.0 | (8.9) |
|  | Turkey | 198.6 | (2.5) | c | c | 203.7 | (10.5) | 198.8 | (2.5) | 237.7 | (13.7) | 205.3 | (5.1) | 191.8 | (3.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 232.1 | (3.5) | 230.4 | (4.3) | C | c | 231.8 | (2.6) | 238.8 | (8.4) | 227.5 | (3.3) | 238.3 | (6.0) |
|  | United States | 259.0 | (5.4) | 246.3 | (10.4) | 247.8 | (14.1) | 259.0 | (5.1) | 230.3 | (5.6) | 272.8 | (7.1) | 245.7 | (7.9) |
|  | OECD average | 215.2 | (0.5) | 213.2 | (1.4) | 224.7 | (1.4) | 205.0 | (0.8) | 224.2 | (1.8) | 214.9 | (0.6) | 214.7 | (0.8) |


|  | Albania | 176.0 | (1.9) | 177.8 | (9.9) | 184.0 | (2.4) | 170.5 | (2.4) | 176.9 | (3.5) | 179.5 | (2.9) | 169.8 | (3.2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 235.0 | (5.9) | 311.0 | (14.3) | 232.3 | (6.8) | 275.0 | (8.9) | 233.4 | (16.1) | 265.5 | (10.2) | 262.4 | (10.0) |
|  | Brazil | 210.4 | (1.8) | 203.2 | (7.1) | 221.6 | (4.8) | 205.2 | (2.0) | 211.7 | (9.8) | 208.2 | (2.6) | 207.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Bulgaria | 140.4 | (1.5) | c | C | 206.1 | (8.8) | 138.5 | (1.5) | 169.2 | (11.4) | 141.9 | (1.8) | 135.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Colombia | 228.9 | (3.7) | 248.2 | (8.7) | 238.6 | (5.7) | 227.8 | (4.5) | 233.7 | (12.9) | 227.8 | (7.2) | 233.4 | (4.8) |
|  | Costa Rica | 185.3 | (1.9) | 211.0 | (6.5) | 193.3 | (1.5) | 182.9 | (3.6) | 191.4 | (2.5) | 186.5 | (2.4) | 195.7 | (7.9) |
|  | Croatia | 164.1 | (1.2) | C | c | C | c | 164.4 | (1.2) | c | C | 162.0 | (1.8) | 168.5 | (1.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 196.0 | (0.6) | 212.4 | (1.6) | 225.4 | (2.7) | 196.9 | (0.6) | 201.3 | (3.4) | 195.2 | (0.7) | 202.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 279.3 | (5.6) | 279.5 | (2.8) | 277.5 | (3.3) | 280.8 | (2.9) | C | c | C | c | 279.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 189.4 | (6.6) | 172.8 | (5.8) | 204.4 | (6.6) | 161.8 | (4.4) | 177.9 | (6.9) | 187.2 | (7.2) | 174.2 | (7.8) |
|  | Jordan | 265.2 | (2.2) | 263.5 | (9.5) | 264.9 | (2.5) | C | C | 273.6 | (6.1) | 266.2 | (3.4) | 261.5 | (4.3) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 107.8 | (2.4) | 211.9 | (30.9) | 108.0 | (2.7) | 111.6 | (4.4) | 103.1 | (4.2) | 102.4 | (4.7) | 117.6 | (4.6) |
|  | Latvia | 157.6 | (1.5) | C | C | 156.9 | (1.4) | 183.0 | (19.8) | 149.2 | (2.9) | 162.8 | (2.1) | 157.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 204.7 | (11.0) | C | C | 209.9 | (11.5) | c | c | c | C | 201.5 | (10.2) | C | c |
|  | Lithuania | 203.0 | (1.3) | C | C | 203.4 | (1.3) | C | c | 202.3 | (3.1) | 205.3 | (2.0) | 201.8 | (2.1) |
|  | Macao-China | C | C | 265.7 | (0.6) | 261.4 | (0.9) | 269.7 | (1.0) | C | c | C | c | 265.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Malaysia | 200.5 | (2.5) | 262.1 | (10.8) | 198.7 | (6.4) | 202.3 | (2.7) | 205.3 | (8.8) | 202.4 | (3.7) | 200.5 | (5.5) |
|  | Montenegro | 149.6 | (0.8) | C | C | C | C | 149.6 | (0.8) | C | C | 152.4 | (1.0) | 143.3 | (1.3) |
|  | Peru | 262.7 | (4.0) | 271.6 | (11.0) | 246.5 | (9.5) | 263.2 | (3.9) | 252.6 | (6.5) | 269.9 | (5.9) | 252.6 | (5.9) |
|  | Qatar | 213.5 | (0.9) | 249.5 | (1.2) | 252.4 | (2.2) | 223.4 | (0.8) | 230.9 | (2.2) | 220.4 | (1.1) | 233.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Romania | 178.8 | (1.4) | C | C | 178.9 | (1.4) | C | C | 186.9 | (6.6) | 176.9 | (2.0) | 180.2 | (3.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 135.1 | (2.1) | c | C | 137.0 | (2.1) | 125.8 | (4.7) | 132.3 | (3.3) | 135.8 | (3.1) | 135.7 | (3.3) |
|  | Serbia | 145.0 | (1.1) | c | C | C | c | 144.7 | (0.9) | C | c | 144.1 | (1.1) | 146.2 | (2.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 246.2 | (3.0) | 267.0 | (15.6) | 314.4 | (3.3) | 199.9 | (2.7) | c | c | c | c | 248.1 | (2.7) |
|  | Singapore | 220.1 | (0.4) | c | c | 221.6 | (2.9) | 223.7 | (1.5) | c | C | c | C | 222.4 | (1.5) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 264.1 | (2.6) | 234.4 | (5.5) | 292.0 | (3.2) | 231.8 | (3.1) | C | C | 259.5 | (5.9) | 249.8 | (4.1) |
|  | Thailand | 139.5 | (1.7) | 133.9 | (6.1) | 178.2 | (2.7) | 128.1 | (1.9) | 164.6 | (5.7) | 134.5 | (2.1) | 132.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Tunisia | 306.7 | (4.4) | C | C | 295.7 | (5.7) | 311.1 | (5.7) | 298.0 | (18.0) | 305.8 | (4.8) | 307.3 | (9.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 289.9 | (3.1) | 253.6 | (3.8) | 257.3 | (5.5) | 271.2 | (2.3) | 298.8 | (6.7) | 287.2 | (4.1) | 257.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 137.5 | (1.9) | 139.6 | (4.0) | 142.2 | (3.3) | 135.7 | (1.7) | 134.9 | (6.4) | 137.6 | (2.4) | 139.0 | (2.2) |
|  | Viet Nam | 190.3 | (3.1) | 225.6 | (12.5) | 233.5 | (9.1) | 188.8 | (3.2) | 199.3 | (5.3) | 181.3 | (4.3) | 196.7 | (7.6) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in science (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| 8 Australia | 224.3 | (2.1) | 225.3 | (2.1) | 229.2 | (2.1) | 229.9 | (2.3) | 229.2 | (2.8) | 226.2 | (1.5) | 227.3 | (2.8) |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ Austria | 193.0 | (7.9) | 189.8 | (7.5) | 203.9 | (6.3) | 212.2 | (7.4) | 181.8 | (12.3) | 197.2 | (6.3) | 221.7 | (9.5) |
| Belgium | 173.2 | (3.4) | 184.9 | (4.5) | 200.1 | (4.9) | 211.1 | (4.6) | 164.6 | (6.8) | 193.5 | (5.1) | 204.8 | (4.1) |
| Canada | 294.8 | (4.9) | 300.0 | (4.2) | 313.1 | (4.4) | 316.5 | (4.6) | 278.9 | (7.4) | 315.6 | (3.7) | 308.2 | (6.2) |
| Chile | 264.6 | (9.5) | 287.9 | (9.4) | 303.4 | (9.1) | 327.4 | (8.7) | 267.2 | (7.9) | 293.2 | (9.6) | 329.9 | (10.5) |
| Czech Republic | 195.4 | (7.2) | 207.8 | (6.4) | 222.9 | (6.7) | 238.7 | (5.6) | 204.3 | (9.7) | 200.6 | (4.5) | 268.2 | (8.1) |
| Denmark | 178.5 | (3.6) | 169.5 | (3.8) | 177.3 | (3.7) | 181.4 | (4.2) | 180.7 | (5.2) | 175.0 | (3.2) | 178.1 | (4.1) |
| Estonia | 191.9 | (4.7) | 192.0 | (4.9) | 196.8 | (3.4) | 203.4 | (5.2) | 199.4 | (6.4) | 194.0 | (3.7) | 198.8 | (5.6) |
| Finland | 180.5 | (2.1) | 187.9 | (3.0) | 191.8 | (2.7) | 194.6 | (2.5) | 186.3 | (3.8) | 188.3 | (1.9) | 191.5 | (3.5) |
| France | 152.8 | (5.3) | 157.2 | (5.8) | 180.2 | (5.4) | 205.2 | (5.3) | 131.3 | (5.1) | 169.5 | (4.3) | 204.6 | (4.7) |
| Germany | 236.8 | (5.2) | 251.8 | (6.0) | 259.0 | (6.9) | 271.4 | (4.3) | 237.0 | (7.6) | 241.3 | (5.5) | 288.7 | (6.5) |
| Greece | 220.5 | (3.3) | 226.7 | (2.8) | 232.5 | (2.8) | 237.3 | (2.7) | 213.3 | (5.3) | 229.9 | (1.5) | 238.2 | (2.5) |
| Hungary | 191.2 | (6.5) | 188.5 | (4.9) | 189.9 | (4.7) | 203.0 | (5.1) | 188.4 | (8.5) | 190.6 | (6.0) | 200.1 | (5.0) |
| Iceland | 139.9 | (3.1) | 138.7 | (3.2) | 141.4 | (3.1) | 145.7 | (3.2) | 136.6 | (3.7) | 141.7 | (2.0) | 142.9 | (3.2) |
| Ireland | 137.7 | (3.3) | 142.7 | (2.7) | 152.1 | (2.8) | 149.3 | (2.2) | 130.9 | (7.0) | 149.3 | (2.1) | 145.8 | (2.9) |
| Israel | 179.0 | (5.4) | 191.0 | (5.5) | 197.0 | (6.9) | 219.5 | (6.0) | 185.3 | (6.0) | 198.3 | (5.5) | 203.1 | (6.5) |
| Italy | 133.6 | (1.6) | 134.7 | (1.4) | 138.4 | (1.8) | 135.5 | (1.9) | 136.0 | (2.7) | 137.2 | (1.8) | 132.8 | (2.7) |
| Japan | 151.1 | (3.4) | 158.8 | (4.0) | 168.3 | (4.0) | 183.6 | (3.9) | 130.7 | (3.8) | 163.7 | (5.2) | 203.2 | (6.0) |
| Korea | 181.2 | (4.2) | 197.6 | (5.2) | 202.3 | (9.0) | 216.7 | (11.9) | 161.3 | (5.9) | 199.7 | (3.4) | 238.0 | (23.8) |
| Luxembourg | 144.7 | (2.5) | 143.2 | (2.6) | 158.7 | (3.0) | 180.8 | (2.5) | 148.2 | (1.6) | 134.2 | (3.2) | 174.8 | (1.5) |
| Mexico | 239.5 | (3.2) | 251.5 | (3.6) | 257.2 | (3.7) | 259.2 | (2.8) | 245.6 | (4.2) | 251.8 | (2.8) | 258.2 | (3.1) |
| Netherlands | 159.9 | (8.2) | 156.6 | (6.9) | 175.2 | (6.9) | 167.7 | (7.9) | 159.8 | (7.4) | 163.3 | (7.8) | 170.9 | (6.7) |
| New Zealand | 231.0 | (5.0) | 241.0 | (4.1) | 242.2 | (4.9) | 277.5 | (7.6) | 234.9 | (5.3) | 234.4 | (3.3) | 288.9 | (10.2) |
| Norway | 147.5 | (3.4) | 144.4 | (2.5) | 142.1 | (2.4) | 143.6 | (2.9) | 150.2 | (5.3) | 142.3 | (1.9) | 146.6 | (3.7) |
| Poland | 169.8 | (2.9) | 169.4 | (2.7) | 165.8 | (2.8) | 172.2 | (3.7) | 172.4 | (4.7) | 167.1 | (3.7) | 169.8 | (5.9) |
| Portugal | 185.3 | (16.7) | 220.1 | (10.6) | 258.9 | (12.9) | 289.5 | (12.9) | 197.0 | (21.4) | 238.7 | (8.7) | 308.3 | (23.6) |
| Slovak Republic | 132.3 | (7.3) | 134.2 | (7.6) | 165.0 | (6.3) | 215.7 | (6.7) | 107.4 | (10.3) | 146.1 | (8.5) | 233.9 | (9.4) |
| Slovenia | 167.0 | (3.7) | 176.1 | (3.7) | 191.8 | (3.8) | 204.9 | (3.7) | 150.1 | (2.3) | 182.2 | (2.8) | 220.7 | (2.9) |
| Spain | 168.5 | (2.6) | 179.2 | (3.7) | 186.1 | (2.6) | 203.6 | (3.4) | 172.1 | (3.8) | 180.2 | (2.8) | 202.8 | (3.4) |
| Sweden | 184.5 | (4.4) | 187.3 | (3.3) | 189.1 | (3.3) | 192.7 | (4.5) | 182.8 | (4.8) | 186.4 | (2.9) | 196.1 | (7.5) |
| Switzerland | 162.3 | (6.2) | 161.0 | (5.3) | 157.9 | (5.7) | 176.3 | (8.4) | 159.9 | (5.3) | 149.6 | (4.7) | 194.1 | (9.9) |
| Turkey | 140.0 | (4.9) | 152.4 | (8.0) | 170.9 | (8.9) | 205.1 | (13.2) | 134.6 | (4.5) | 142.2 | (5.2) | 231.1 | (13.9) |
| United Kingdom | 273.1 | (4.5) | 289.2 | (5.5) | 297.1 | (5.9) | 321.5 | (6.6) | 275.2 | (6.2) | 285.3 | (3.7) | 335.7 | (12.1) |
| United States | 245.9 | (8.1) | 243.7 | (8.0) | 258.1 | (7.3) | 272.4 | (6.1) | 241.8 | (11.0) | 253.8 | (5.9) | 267.6 | (8.1) |
| OECD average | 187.4 | (1.0) | 193.6 | (0.9) | 203.4 | (1.0) | 216.6 | (1.1) | 184.6 | (1.2) | 196.0 | (0.8) | 221.3 | (1.5) |


| $\sim$ Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 190.5 | (10.4) | 204.2 | (9.3) | 222.9 | (8.1) | 248.6 | (11.3) | 179.7 | (8.0) | 208.2 | (10.9) | 257.6 | (9.5) |
| ※ Brazil | 137.9 | (2.5) | 142.4 | (2.9) | 164.2 | (4.5) | 201.9 | (8.2) | 138.3 | (2.4) | 145.5 | (2.6) | 210.5 | (8.2) |
| Bulgaria | 268.3 | (4.6) | 261.3 | (5.8) | 248.8 | (3.7) | 248.6 | (5.6) | 276.7 | (5.2) | 258.3 | (6.2) | 240.6 | (5.3) |
| Colombia | 191.8 | (6.2) | 204.1 | (5.3) | 205.1 | (5.1) | 218.5 | (10.2) | 199.6 | (6.4) | 198.2 | (5.5) | 217.8 | (9.1) |
| Costa Rica | 192.8 | (2.7) | 197.9 | (3.4) | 202.1 | (3.3) | 218.9 | (5.6) | 193.5 | (3.1) | 197.3 | (2.4) | 228.3 | (9.2) |
| Croatia | 139.6 | (6.5) | 163.6 | (6.4) | 191.6 | (6.6) | 234.6 | (7.5) | 125.1 | (8.0) | 175.3 | (9.1) | 274.6 | (6.6) |
| Cyprus* | 184.4 | (1.1) | 185.5 | (1.0) | 186.0 | (1.3) | 188.6 | (1.3) | 185.0 | (0.8) | 185.1 | (0.7) | 188.8 | (1.4) |
| Hong Kong-China | 220.6 | (7.0) | 221.9 | (6.4) | 228.4 | (7.7) | 270.0 | (8.9) | 208.1 | (5.1) | 237.7 | (5.6) | 267.6 | (8.4) |
| Indonesia | 175.4 | (5.8) | 175.9 | (7.4) | 195.6 | (9.2) | 248.7 | (16.5) | 166.5 | (6.2) | 174.2 | (9.3) | 279.3 | (15.5) |
| Jordan | 262.4 | (4.4) | 274.8 | (5.7) | 285.4 | (5.0) | 287.9 | (6.9) | 261.0 | (5.8) | 276.2 | (3.7) | 297.9 | (9.3) |
| Kazakhstan | 206.3 | (9.7) | 188.0 | (7.9) | 213.3 | (9.6) | 228.3 | (11.2) | 222.8 | (11.6) | 204.6 | (9.8) | 206.7 | (13.4) |
| Latvia | 215.0 | (6.8) | 213.1 | (5.8) | 236.9 | (6.3) | 256.6 | (5.6) | 220.7 | (10.2) | 220.8 | (4.7) | 251.7 | (5.5) |
| Liechtenstein | 138.9 | (7.4) | 150.1 | (12.7) | 172.5 | (34.8) | 201.8 | (32.2) | c | C | 173.7 | (22.0) | c | c |
| Lithuania | 321.0 | (2.8) | 321.6 | (2.9) | 319.9 | (2.5) | 320.5 | (2.3) | 321.8 | (3.2) | 318.0 | (2.0) | 325.7 | (2.8) |
| Macao-China | 166.4 | (3.9) | 185.2 | (4.4) | 188.2 | (5.0) | 216.5 | (5.6) | 165.3 | (2.8) | 198.6 | (5.6) | 223.0 | (4.6) |
| Malaysia | 183.7 | (4.4) | 175.8 | (4.7) | 186.8 | (4.6) | 208.0 | (5.4) | 180.6 | (4.0) | 186.3 | (4.4) | 201.5 | (7.4) |
| Montenegro | 104.1 | (2.6) | 102.7 | (2.6) | 106.4 | (2.6) | 107.6 | (2.6) | 100.5 | (1.7) | 111.4 | (2.4) | 105.9 | (1.7) |
| Peru | 200.3 | (4.7) | 201.4 | (6.1) | 223.3 | (8.7) | 235.1 | (8.6) | 198.9 | (4.6) | 208.3 | (5.2) | 232.8 | (7.6) |
| Qatar | 250.6 | (2.2) | 264.3 | (3.2) | 275.0 | (3.1) | 265.5 | (2.8) | 261.6 | (2.3) | 254.3 | (2.5) | 269.7 | (2.1) |
| Romania | 132.5 | (6.7) | 152.4 | (6.0) | 155.4 | (6.9) | 206.6 | (8.3) | 137.0 | (7.7) | 147.1 | (7.2) | 204.0 | (9.0) |
| Russian Federation | 253.3 | (6.2) | 269.4 | (6.5) | 285.1 | (7.5) | 311.3 | (8.2) | 257.2 | (8.6) | 272.7 | (6.7) | 308.2 | (8.8) |
| Serbia | 155.3 | (7.7) | 158.2 | (6.6) | 146.1 | (4.7) | 139.1 | (4.8) | 166.7 | (9.3) | 145.3 | (5.4) | 136.7 | (4.2) |
| Shanghai-China | 225.8 | (9.5) | 250.7 | (7.4) | 280.8 | (8.1) | 298.9 | (6.9) | 195.0 | (12.2) | 282.5 | (13.4) | 303.9 | (8.4) |
| Singapore | 253.0 | (4.1) | 286.1 | (4.9) | 320.1 | (5.8) | 350.5 | (5.2) | 260.5 | (3.1) | 286.9 | (3.4) | 383.2 | (6.3) |
| Chinese Taipei | 164.8 | (4.2) | 185.4 | (4.3) | 192.2 | (4.7) | 220.4 | (4.6) | 148.9 | (7.8) | 193.3 | (6.4) | 229.0 | (6.6) |
| Thailand | 250.4 | (9.9) | 244.9 | (6.8) | 258.8 | (7.9) | 296.6 | (10.6) | 243.7 | (10.3) | 248.4 | (8.6) | 300.2 | (12.2) |
| Tunisia | 165.0 | (6.6) | 185.7 | (7.9) | 185.0 | (7.8) | 184.2 | (5.4) | 158.8 | (5.6) | 187.4 | (5.7) | 189.2 | (6.8) |
| United Arab Emirates | 263.7 | (6.8) | 308.1 | (6.6) | 334.5 | (7.0) | 320.9 | (7.7) | 263.9 | (7.5) | 311.4 | (8.3) | 330.6 | (7.8) |
| Uruguay | 145.2 | (4.2) | 144.3 | (5.5) | 155.0 | (6.8) | 165.7 | (5.6) | 142.4 | (4.3) | 157.9 | (5.1) | 160.2 | (9.4) |
| Viet Nam | 209.0 | (8.9) | 228.1 | (8.8) | 234.9 | (10.0) | 281.4 | (11.9) | 210.4 | (9.2) | 236.3 | (9.0) | 281.2 | (14.0) |
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Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in science (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than $\mathbf{3 0 0 0}$ people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town (3 000 to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 231.1 | (1.6) | 221.4 | (2.0) | 222.2 | (1.3) | 262.1 | (4.1) | 222.2 | (5.2) | 225.6 | (2.3) | 228.1 | (1.7) |
|  | Austria | 199.2 | (5.4) | 199.8 | (14.6) | 326.8 | (14.5) | 194.6 | (4.9) | 210.8 | (27.4) | 193.9 | (7.8) | 205.6 | (7.8) |
|  | Belgium | 190.2 | (5.6) | 193.6 | (3.6) | 155.2 | (6.8) | 194.9 | (2.7) | 195.9 | (22.6) | 194.3 | (3.4) | 187.3 | (6.5) |
|  | Canada | 309.6 | (2.9) | 269.5 | (13.7) | 249.4 | (5.0) | 315.2 | (3.0) | 287.9 | (7.0) | 305.6 | (4.2) | 309.2 | (4.0) |
|  | Chile | 285.9 | (10.0) | 303.1 | (7.1) | 283.8 | (31.4) | 296.1 | (5.4) | 245.7 | (13.9) | 295.2 | (9.8) | 297.6 | (6.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 216.9 | (4.1) | 206.2 | (20.8) | 219.7 | (3.9) | 212.5 | (6.0) | 203.1 | (15.6) | 215.9 | (5.2) | 219.3 | (9.1) |
|  | Denmark | 173.6 | (2.6) | 182.0 | (6.1) | 176.6 | (2.3) | c | c | 170.2 | (5.4) | 177.6 | (2.9) | 174.9 | (4.9) |
|  | Estonia | 196.3 | (2.5) | 193.8 | (20.3) | 195.8 | (2.5) | 210.7 | (15.5) | 202.0 | (6.3) | 187.1 | (2.9) | 204.7 | (4.8) |
|  | Finland | 188.3 | (1.6) | 205.7 | (6.0) | 188.5 | (1.6) | c | c | 187.6 | (6.4) | 186.9 | (1.8) | 193.5 | (2.9) |
|  | France | 174.7 | (3.1) | 169.6 | (5.7) | 125.0 | (4.9) | 190.9 | (2.9) | 139.4 | (10.5) | 174.1 | (3.8) | 185.4 | (6.4) |
|  | Germany | 254.7 | (4.1) | 259.3 | (14.0) | 255.9 | (3.5) | 204.8 | (47.9) | c | c | 252.2 | (4.6) | 262.5 | (9.3) |
|  | Greece | 228.9 | (1.6) | c | c | 189.2 | (8.4) | 230.5 | (1.6) | 231.3 | (3.4) | 227.3 | (2.2) | 232.2 | (2.5) |
|  | Hungary | 193.0 | (4.1) | 191.8 | (12.2) | 249.2 | (6.8) | 185.9 | (4.1) | 203.6 | (31.1) | 194.9 | (5.0) | 188.7 | (6.1) |
|  | Iceland | 141.3 | (1.6) | c | c | 141.2 | (1.5) | c | c | 139.7 | (3.2) | 142.1 | (2.0) | 141.1 | (2.9) |
|  | Ireland | 143.4 | (2.9) | 146.0 | (2.7) | 150.2 | (1.1) | 137.2 | (4.1) | 152.5 | (3.3) | 146.7 | (2.3) | 136.4 | (3.9) |
|  | Israel | 196.6 | (3.5) | , | c | 205.4 | (7.6) | 195.1 | (3.7) | 182.7 | (10.0) | 202.7 | (4.5) | 194.9 | (6.0) |
|  | Italy | 135.6 | (1.2) | 143.1 | (10.9) | 124.9 | (8.4) | 135.7 | (1.2) | 133.3 | (5.4) | 135.9 | (1.6) | 135.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Japan | 157.3 | (3.1) | 184.9 | (7.1) | c | c | 165.4 | (3.1) | c | c | 154.3 | (5.9) | 169.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Korea | 209.0 | (11.8) | 189.1 | (4.4) | 176.6 | (4.7) | 200.9 | (6.9) | c | c | 200.0 | (10.7) | 199.4 | (7.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 154.5 | (1.1) | 167.2 | (3.6) | 140.4 | (1.2) | 181.3 | (2.0) | c | c | 156.2 | (1.1) | c | c |
|  | Mexico | 252.8 | (2.1) | 240.9 | (5.3) | 261.2 | (2.9) | 246.5 | (2.3) | 238.1 | (5.5) | 253.8 | (3.3) | 254.4 | (2.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 162.4 | (8.8) | 162.5 | (4.0) | 171.7 | (4.3) | 149.4 | (7.2) | c | c | 160.7 | (4.5) | 166.8 | (7.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 244.4 | (3.2) | 311.0 | (37.7) | 200.4 | (6.6) | 251.3 | (3.7) | 229.7 | (8.3) | 233.6 | (4.1) | 259.4 | (6.0) |
|  | Norway | 143.3 | (1.6) | c | c | 143.8 | (1.7) | c | c | 141.5 | (2.8) | 141.5 | (2.1) | 152.2 | (4.5) |
|  | Poland | 168.5 | (2.6) | 198.0 | (13.3) | 168.7 | (2.5) | c | c | 165.9 | (4.5) | 172.7 | (3.6) | 167.2 | (5.3) |
|  | Portugal | 234.3 | (9.9) | 277.0 | (19.7) | 129.7 | (3.1) | 360.7 | (14.7) | 254.5 | (83.9) | 245.0 | (10.7) | 208.6 | (13.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 154.1 | (4.6) | 234.8 | (42.1) | 195.2 | (5.5) | 141.3 | (5.9) | 188.8 | (8.2) | 154.5 | (6.0) | 179.1 | (12.9) |
|  | Slovenia | 186.3 | (1.6) | 205.5 | (8.7) | 206.8 | (9.5) | 183.4 | (1.5) | 197.4 | (10.0) | 184.7 | (1.7) | 189.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Spain | 174.4 | (2.1) | 201.6 | (3.1) | 184.2 | (1.8) | , | c | 161.4 | (8.2) | 181.6 | (2.6) | 189.7 | (3.4) |
|  | Sweden | 190.1 | (2.6) | 178.5 | (12.8) | 187.3 | (2.4) | 250.3 | (34.8) | 178.0 | (4.4) | 187.2 | (3.8) | 198.6 | (6.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 160.8 | (3.3) | 226.7 | (38.2) | 158.4 | (3.6) | 184.6 | (11.3) | 164.8 | (10.0) | 162.3 | (4.7) | 174.4 | (10.5) |
|  | Turkey | 164.7 | (6.2) | c | c | 166.8 | (8.9) | 166.9 | (6.5) | 193.7 | (16.7) | 176.2 | (12.2) | 158.0 | (7.4) |
|  | United Kingdom | 286.0 | (3.8) | 306.9 | (8.1) | c | c | 295.0 | (3.7) | 304.4 | (11.9) | 289.7 | (4.0) | 307.9 | (9.9) |
|  | United States | 256.9 | (5.2) | 241.3 | (17.0) | 233.2 | (9.9) | 257.6 | (4.9) | 227.3 | (6.9) | 271.1 | (6.5) | 241.4 | (8.0) |
|  | OECD average | 198.8 | (0.8) | 214.2 | (2.9) | 193.2 | (1.4) | 214.3 | (2.3) | 198.4 | (3.4) | 199.5 | (0.9) | 203.4 | (1.1) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 148.6 | (2.0) | 151.5 | (7.4) | 148.7 | (2.6) | 148.9 | (2.5) | 143.7 | (3.4) | 151.4 | (3.3) | 149.1 | (3.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{1}{5}$ | Argentina | 194.2 | (7.7) | 260.6 | (9.5) | 182.9 | (10.0) | 234.4 | (6.3) | 200.4 | (24.0) | 212.5 | (7.9) | 222.7 | (9.0) |
| む | Brazil | 144.0 | (2.1) | 228.0 | (13.3) | 156.8 | (2.6) | 162.7 | (3.6) | 142.0 | (10.5) | 150.9 | (4.8) | 171.8 | (4.4) |
|  | Bulgaria | 257.2 | (3.3) | C | C | 280.1 | (19.1) | 256.8 | (3.2) | 276.0 | (18.0) | 256.3 | (4.0) | 257.7 | (5.6) |
|  | Colombia | 200.7 | (3.8) | 232.1 | (12.9) | 209.2 | (4.9) | 202.4 | (5.8) | 208.8 | (10.7) | 194.4 | (8.0) | 210.1 | (6.3) |
|  | Costa Rica | 197.9 | (2.5) | 243.4 | (11.2) | 194.1 | (1.9) | 216.0 | (5.1) | 202.3 | (5.6) | 201.5 | (3.4) | 209.9 | (7.4) |
|  | Croatia | 180.3 | (5.6) | C | C | c | C | 182.2 | (5.4) | C | C | 162.6 | (5.9) | 215.6 | (11.0) |
|  | Cyprus* | 184.9 | (0.5) | 196.3 | (2.9) | 214.1 | (3.7) | 185.2 | (0.5) | 189.2 | (2.8) | 185.2 | (0.7) | 187.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 239.2 | (12.2) | 235.7 | (4.5) | 208.5 | (4.2) | 249.8 | (5.8) | C | c | C | C | 235.4 | (4.2) |
|  | Indonesia | 211.3 | (9.2) | 182.4 | (9.5) | 194.7 | (6.2) | 202.9 | (11.5) | 180.8 | (10.7) | 198.5 | (8.9) | 223.8 | (20.0) |
|  | Jordan | 274.2 | (2.8) | 294.0 | (11.5) | 277.6 | (3.1) | c | c | 272.0 | (7.0) | 272.9 | (3.8) | 283.6 | (5.9) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 209.1 | (7.0) | 204.2 | (24.3) | 190.9 | (6.6) | 258.8 | (14.5) | 226.0 | (9.5) | 206.4 | (17.3) | 196.6 | (11.4) |
|  | Latvia | 228.0 | (3.6) | c | c | 229.0 | (3.4) | 243.5 | (12.3) | 229.3 | (7.8) | 229.5 | (5.3) | 229.5 | (5.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 166.4 | (12.4) | c | c | 154.6 | (13.2) | C | c | C | C | 166.5 | (11.7) | C | C |
|  | Lithuania | 320.8 | (1.4) | C | c | 320.7 | (1.4) | c | c | 324.5 | (3.8) | 321.2 | (1.8) | 318.1 | (2.5) |
|  | Macao-China | C | c | 190.9 | (2.2) | 157.7 | (2.0) | 231.7 | (4.2) | C | c | c | C | 188.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Malaysia | 189.0 | (2.7) | 172.9 | (21.8) | 170.2 | (8.2) | 189.2 | (2.7) | 186.4 | (7.3) | 191.4 | (3.9) | 182.9 | (5.5) |
|  | Montenegro | 105.0 | (1.1) | C | C | C | C | 105.1 | (1.1) | C | C | 108.9 | (1.4) | 96.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Peru | 204.3 | (3.1) | 255.0 | (16.1) | 209.1 | (7.4) | 216.8 | (4.0) | 203.5 | (7.3) | 214.3 | (6.5) | 219.9 | (5.9) |
|  | Qatar | 253.9 | (1.6) | 278.8 | (2.2) | 264.2 | (2.4) | 263.4 | (1.4) | 263.6 | (4.3) | 252.6 | (2.1) | 272.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Romania | 161.1 | (5.0) | C | C | 161.6 | (5.0) | c | C | 154.2 | (14.5) | 154.9 | (6.4) | 173.9 | (9.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 278.9 | (4.2) | c | c | 279.0 | (4.5) | 281.8 | (9.1) | 264.4 | (9.4) | 268.6 | (7.2) | 293.5 | (6.6) |
|  | Serbia | 150.2 | (4.1) | C | C | C | c | 150.3 | (3.9) | C | C | 150.9 | (6.1) | 150.1 | (5.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 259.9 | (6.1) | 303.4 | (21.4) | 339.9 | (10.1) | 203.9 | (4.2) | C | c | c | c | 264.1 | (5.6) |
|  | Singapore | 303.4 | (2.1) | C | C | 199.4 | (3.7) | 304.7 | (2.3) | c | C | c | c | 304.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 205.7 | (2.9) | 157.6 | (6.4) | 261.1 | (4.3) | 148.7 | (3.5) | c | c | 197.7 | (6.9) | 187.3 | (4.7) |
|  | Thailand | 275.8 | (6.3) | 190.1 | (7.3) | 178.2 | (2.7) | 284.7 | (6.5) | 276.7 | (19.7) | 250.9 | (7.5) | 273.9 | (12.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 180.5 | (3.8) | C | C | 144.9 | (5.4) | 198.0 | (4.6) | 176.2 | (23.9) | 180.7 | (4.6) | 178.1 | (7.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 277.0 | (4.3) | 329.5 | (8.2) | 221.0 | (7.8) | 319.9 | (4.1) | 276.1 | (8.4) | 282.8 | (8.2) | 322.2 | (5.5) |
|  | Uruguay | 149.6 | (3.4) | 164.7 | (12.2) | 143.8 | (3.5) | 157.9 | (4.9) | 154.7 | (9.1) | 150.9 | (4.6) | 154.5 | (6.3) |
|  | Viet Nam | 236.5 | (6.4) | 270.3 | (35.8) | 166.3 | (11.3) | 245.8 | (7.0) | 205.9 | (8.1) | 254.2 | (10.9) | 277.1 | (14.0) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 9/10]
Students' learning time in school, by school features
Table IV.3.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics, language-of-instruction and science (minutes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bottom quarter } \\ & \text { of ESCS } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Second quarter } \\ & \text { of ESCS } \end{aligned}$ |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 689.1 | (5.2) | 688.3 | (5.3) | 701.7 | (4.8) | 695.2 | (5.0) | 695.7 | (6.8) | 693.9 | (3.5) | 691.1 | (6.0) |
| Austria | 492.8 | (11.4) | 487.3 | (7.8) | 500.9 | (7.8) | 516.3 | (7.7) | 501.7 | (14.4) | 476.4 | (9.9) | 531.4 | (10.5) |
| - Belgium | 602.1 | (5.6) | 616.7 | (6.6) | 650.5 | (7.6) | 666.5 | (6.7) | 574.7 | (10.1) | 631.1 | (8.6) | 664.9 | (6.2) |
| Canada | 918.4 | (12.9) | 920.8 | (10.8) | 951.6 | (12.2) | 955.8 | (13.1) | 881.2 | (22.2) | 962.3 | (9.8) | 927.9 | (18.5) |
| Chile | 1039.3 | (26.2) | 1062.4 | (23.3) | 1112.4 | (28.8) | 1053.9 | (24.0) | 1050.1 | (21.8) | 1063.4 | (31.2) | 1087.8 | (27.8) |
| Czech Republic | 557.2 | (9.1) | 569.6 | (8.3) | 585.3 | (8.0) | 599.6 | (6.8) | 549.1 | (15.9) | 573.2 | (7.0) | 616.0 | (9.9) |
| Denmark | 716.7 | (12.6) | 692.1 | (8.7) | 727.5 | (11.5) | 716.2 | (10.6) | 713.7 | (10.7) | 713.8 | (10.1) | 711.7 | (11.8) |
| Estonia | 610.6 | (6.2) | 612.5 | (6.1) | 616.9 | (4.7) | 626.7 | (5.7) | 616.6 | (8.0) | 614.7 | (4.7) | 622.4 | (6.0) |
| Finland | 498.3 | (3.8) | 513.6 | (5.1) | 518.8 | (4.4) | 524.3 | (5.0) | 507.7 | (7.3) | 513.6 | (4.3) | 518.6 | (7.2) |
| France | 565.5 | (10.8) | 564.0 | (10.3) | 612.1 | (11.2) | 646.8 | (9.0) | 543.4 | (12.3) | 586.9 | (8.8) | 641.7 | (8.7) |
| Germany | 636.9 | (8.9) | 643.2 | (10.9) | 641.3 | (11.4) | 638.8 | (8.8) | 653.3 | (13.4) | 623.7 | (9.2) | 655.3 | (14.4) |
| Greece | 608.3 | (5.1) | 621.3 | (4.7) | 629.3 | (5.1) | 633.8 | (4.6) | 602.7 | (9.2) | 621.8 | (3.0) | 633.7 | (4.3) |
| Hungary | 503.3 | (8.8) | 507.1 | (6.2) | 510.1 | (7.6) | 527.5 | (7.6) | 491.8 | (12.3) | 519.5 | (7.8) | 521.3 | (7.3) |
| Iceland | 617.7 | (9.3) | 610.7 | (8.4) | 627.1 | (8.6) | 624.5 | (7.6) | 626.7 | (11.2) | 619.2 | (5.6) | 614.8 | (6.9) |
| Ireland | 506.7 | (5.5) | 514.6 | (4.3) | 522.8 | (5.3) | 517.2 | (4.2) | 502.4 | (10.1) | 519.4 | (4.1) | 514.2 | (6.0) |
| Israel | 610.2 | (10.2) | 615.9 | (10.0) | 619.1 | (8.9) | 668.8 | (10.3) | 613.8 | (12.1) | 626.9 | (9.4) | 641.4 | (10.6) |
| Italy | 652.3 | (3.7) | 648.0 | (3.3) | 645.7 | (4.0) | 638.0 | (4.9) | 662.7 | (4.3) | 644.0 | (4.4) | 634.3 | (6.3) |
| Japan | 547.7 | (9.2) | 588.3 | (8.5) | 619.3 | (8.3) | 665.8 | (9.1) | 486.7 | (10.6) | 606.3 | (11.4) | 722.7 | (11.3) |
| Korea | 578.4 | (8.7) | 610.2 | (9.0) | 622.0 | (12.5) | 656.2 | (17.7) | 519.4 | (11.7) | 631.9 | (9.6) | 685.7 | (32.2) |
| Luxembourg | 548.7 | (4.6) | 530.0 | (5.0) | 551.9 | (5.1) | 584.7 | (4.4) | 544.8 | (3.1) | 512.1 | (6.3) | 579.2 | (2.9) |
| Mexico | 714.4 | (5.7) | 733.8 | (6.5) | 736.3 | (7.2) | 753.6 | (6.8) | 728.0 | (6.4) | 732.3 | (6.1) | 743.0 | (7.4) |
| Netherlands | 506.1 | (12.8) | 488.2 | (10.3) | 516.6 | (9.5) | 492.4 | (10.8) | 534.6 | (17.7) | 494.5 | (10.7) | 488.4 | (9.1) |
| New Zealand | 713.2 | (9.6) | 722.8 | (7.2) | 721.4 | (9.8) | 768.0 | (11.2) | 726.3 | (12.1) | 711.9 | (7.5) | 778.6 | (15.3) |
| Norway | 556.1 | (9.1) | 553.7 | (7.0) | 548.9 | (7.1) | 558.8 | (9.0) | 581.9 | (15.8) | 548.8 | (5.6) | 560.9 | (8.5) |
| Poland | 580.3 | (5.0) | 585.0 | (4.2) | 585.4 | (4.1) | 597.6 | (4.9) | 579.9 | (7.7) | 584.0 | (5.4) | 603.0 | (6.2) |
| Portugal | 755.7 | (31.0) | 775.6 | (17.4) | 799.1 | (15.7) | 824.6 | (21.4) | 775.3 | (33.9) | 781.3 | (11.2) | 825.4 | (35.9) |
| Slovak Republic | 485.0 | (13.6) | 474.3 | (12.9) | 513.8 | (11.5) | 570.4 | (9.4) | 441.5 | (23.4) | 511.4 | (15.2) | 567.3 | (14.2) |
| Slovenia | 479.0 | (5.0) | 495.8 | (4.9) | 527.7 | (5.3) | 552.4 | (4.5) | 447.9 | (3.4) | 510.4 | (4.1) | 578.7 | (3.2) |
| Spain | 592.4 | (5.0) | 591.2 | (4.4) | 595.4 | (4.1) | 612.8 | (5.6) | 596.6 | (7.2) | 587.9 | (5.4) | 615.2 | (7.1) |
| Sweden | 552.1 | (11.6) | 543.4 | (7.1) | 549.5 | (8.0) | 543.9 | (9.7) | 540.3 | (9.2) | 544.7 | (6.9) | 550.9 | (16.9) |
| Switzerland | 581.6 | (8.3) | 573.7 | (9.1) | 558.6 | (9.7) | 587.4 | (10.4) | 579.6 | (10.1) | 567.1 | (8.8) | 586.3 | (14.3) |
| Turkey | 480.7 | (9.6) | 518.8 | (13.5) | 542.2 | (13.1) | 608.8 | (19.1) | 466.9 | (9.0) | 496.6 | (8.9) | 657.2 | (20.4) |
| United Kingdom | 731.7 | (8.8) | 745.7 | (9.4) | 742.1 | (9.9) | 763.0 | (10.6) | 746.9 | (12.1) | 730.6 | (7.7) | 779.3 | (18.4) |
| United States | 746.2 | (23.2) | 731.8 | (22.6) | 773.6 | (17.0) | 807.0 | (15.2) | 723.8 | (31.0) | 773.7 | (16.1) | 785.4 | (20.0) |
| OECD average | 616.9 | (2.0) | 622.1 | (1.7) | 637.6 | (1.8) | 652.9 | (1.8) | 612.0 | (2.5) | 627.3 | (1.7) | 656.9 | (2.5) |


| A Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 620.3 | (21.0) | 685.8 | (22.3) | 737.0 | (18.9) | 760.6 | (25.3) | 613.3 | (19.9) | 690.8 | (20.4) | 789.7 | (25.3) |
| ๕ Brazil | 548.4 | (6.8) | 560.8 | (6.6) | 586.1 | (9.8) | 633.4 | (11.3) | 548.1 | (6.8) | 571.4 | (8.5) | 634.1 | (11.7) |
| Bulgaria | 539.8 | (7.6) | 530.4 | (8.0) | 520.5 | (6.3) | 530.3 | (8.5) | 545.2 | (9.1) | 526.0 | (10.5) | 522.3 | (9.2) |
| Colombia | 675.7 | (16.7) | 697.4 | (14.1) | 706.9 | (13.1) | 727.8 | (20.4) | 695.2 | (16.8) | 687.0 | (15.6) | 724.9 | (19.4) |
| Costa Rica | 581.4 | (6.0) | 577.8 | (7.9) | 600.7 | (7.3) | 627.6 | (8.9) | 579.0 | (6.3) | 579.4 | (6.9) | 661.3 | (12.7) |
| Croatia | 435.4 | (8.0) | 465.9 | (8.1) | 504.4 | (9.3) | 573.6 | (9.9) | 419.8 | (9.8) | 476.4 | (11.2) | 632.4 | (10.4) |
| Cyprus* | 564.9 | (3.3) | 563.9 | (2.6) | 567.6 | (2.8) | 573.4 | (3.1) | 568.0 | (2.7) | 559.9 | (2.0) | 579.8 | (3.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 763.5 | (10.3) | 773.9 | (10.1) | 768.6 | (10.3) | 818.4 | (14.3) | 752.8 | (10.8) | 793.2 | (9.9) | 800.5 | (15.7) |
| Indonesia | 548.3 | (16.7) | 549.4 | (17.2) | 578.8 | (20.7) | 660.9 | (29.2) | 532.0 | (15.3) | 558.3 | (22.1) | 696.0 | (29.1) |
| Jordan | 755.0 | (10.0) | 759.8 | (9.3) | 776.8 | (8.7) | 779.2 | (8.5) | 744.2 | (10.6) | 767.0 | (6.5) | 793.9 | (8.5) |
| Kazakhstan | 482.4 | (11.3) | 461.6 | (10.0) | 499.6 | (13.8) | 544.7 | (19.8) | 488.8 | (13.2) | 479.8 | (10.9) | 528.8 | (23.6) |
| Latvia | 582.6 | (7.6) | 593.6 | (7.6) | 617.6 | (7.6) | 650.3 | (7.7) | 590.1 | (11.5) | 598.1 | (5.9) | 646.5 | (8.0) |
| Liechtenstein | 577.4 | (23.2) | 558.5 | (14.5) | 543.1 | (39.6) | 596.5 | (44.3) | C | c | 632.7 | (35.1) | c | c |
| Lithuania | 692.5 | (3.6) | 694.3 | (4.0) | 694.9 | (4.2) | 698.0 | (4.0) | 690.8 | (4.0) | 690.0 | (3.4) | 708.8 | (6.1) |
| Macao-China | 698.4 | (5.6) | 728.8 | (5.9) | 726.5 | (6.2) | 754.1 | (6.6) | 693.9 | (4.0) | 756.2 | (7.3) | 765.6 | (5.4) |
| Malaysia | 577.0 | (12.2) | 547.2 | (13.1) | 576.9 | (11.7) | 618.5 | (15.6) | 556.3 | (13.8) | 573.5 | (13.8) | 615.6 | (17.4) |
| Montenegro | 379.3 | (4.8) | 388.5 | (5.1) | 404.1 | (4.9) | 420.4 | (3.8) | 367.3 | (3.5) | 399.3 | (5.0) | 427.1 | (3.1) |
| Peru | 757.2 | (18.5) | 710.8 | (17.8) | 755.3 | (20.8) | 777.2 | (16.9) | 736.1 | (16.3) | 730.2 | (17.6) | 778.7 | (14.1) |
| Qatar | 731.7 | (4.2) | 744.6 | (5.0) | 763.9 | (5.4) | 737.0 | (4.5) | 743.0 | (4.2) | 724.6 | (4.2) | 754.5 | (3.4) |
| Romania | 478.0 | (8.7) | 495.1 | (8.2) | 501.1 | (9.3) | 578.8 | (11.6) | 479.6 | (11.0) | 495.7 | (11.1) | 566.6 | (13.9) |
| Russian Federation | 602.7 | (9.7) | 625.4 | (8.2) | 640.1 | (10.3) | 676.7 | (10.3) | 624.1 | (14.1) | 618.7 | (9.3) | 674.9 | (11.0) |
| Serbia | 444.6 | (8.6) | 454.8 | (7.5) | 444.8 | (6.8) | 461.3 | (7.0) | 455.2 | (10.5) | 434.8 | (6.8) | 475.6 | (7.4) |
| Shanghai-China | 734.4 | (16.5) | 747.8 | (14.9) | 791.0 | (14.3) | 810.3 | (12.2) | 665.2 | (25.0) | 809.6 | (24.5) | 820.6 | (16.0) |
| Singapore | 754.9 | (6.3) | 798.5 | (7.4) | 835.0 | (9.0) | 866.3 | (8.3) | 766.6 | (4.1) | 801.2 | (7.2) | 895.4 | (9.7) |
| Chinese Taipei | 622.9 | (9.5) | 678.6 | (11.0) | 705.9 | (9.9) | 762.0 | (10.0) | 585.2 | (19.2) | 696.0 | (14.8) | 793.6 | (13.5) |
| Thailand | 591.4 | (13.6) | 585.8 | (9.8) | 602.1 | (11.6) | 659.1 | (14.6) | 579.3 | (14.7) | 586.2 | (14.0) | 669.6 | (16.5) |
| Tunisia | 709.2 | (14.5) | 743.0 | (16.8) | 752.5 | (16.1) | 754.5 | (19.1) | 694.8 | (13.6) | 746.1 | (13.9) | 773.9 | (17.3) |
| United Arab Emirates | 851.5 | (12.8) | 894.2 | (10.2) | 916.5 | (10.7) | 885.4 | (13.5) | 886.5 | (19.0) | 891.7 | (12.1) | 880.8 | (11.0) |
| Uruguay | 436.9 | (9.7) | 427.8 | (9.9) | 443.8 | (11.6) | 466.9 | (10.3) | 429.7 | (9.6) | 452.8 | (9.3) | 451.9 | (14.8) |
| Viet Nam | 633.6 | (13.0) | 628.6 | (14.3) | 644.7 | (13.7) | 694.1 | (16.7) | 627.0 | (14.3) | 648.0 | (16.1) | 687.4 | (19.4) |

[^27]［Part 10／10］
Students＇learning time in school，by school features

|  |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics，language－of－instruction and science（minutes） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education（ISCED 2） |  | Upper secondary education（ISCED 3） |  | Schools located in a village，hamlet or rural area（fewer than 3000 people） |  | Schools located in a small town or town（ $\mathbf{3} 000$ to about 100000 people） |  | Schools located in a city or a large city（over 100000 people） |  |
|  |  | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． | Mean | S．E． |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 701.4 | （3．7） | 680.8 | （4．5） | 686.3 | （2．9） | 744.1 | （9．0） | 695.2 | （12．0） | 690.6 | （5．5） | 694.3 | （3．5） |
| － | Austria | 500.8 | （6．1） | 482.5 | （21．0） | 709.5 | （18．0） | 491.0 | （5．3） | 491.9 | （31．3） | 495.3 | （8．5） | 508.6 | （10．0） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 635.4 | （8．6） | 628.7 | （5．9） | 663.9 | （18．0） | 631.5 | （3．5） | 666.3 | （42．8） | 629.2 | （5．4） | 642.0 | （10．9） |
|  | Canada | 948.6 | （8．2） | 814.5 | （38．9） | 873.9 | （14．5） | 946.8 | （8．8） | 904.3 | （18．4） | 933.9 | （10．8） | 943.7 | （11．9） |
|  | Chile | 1073.6 | （23．9） | 1070.6 | （20．5） | 1018.0 | （95．8） | 1068.4 | （15．6） | 987.9 | （38．8） | 1115.4 | （23．0） | 1039.2 | （21．5） |
|  | Czech Republic | 582.6 | （5．7） | 503.0 | （26．0） | 619.7 | （5．7） | 530.1 | （7．2） | 624.5 | （22．0） | 569.2 | （7．6） | 579.1 | （9．7） |
|  | Denmark | 711.2 | （8．7） | 719.3 | （12．4） | 713.1 | （7．1） | C | c | 707.4 | （19．0） | 714.3 | （8．3） | 716.2 | （13．0） |
|  | Estonia | 616.4 | （3．4） | 623.4 | （20．1） | 617.1 | （3．4） | 590.0 | （28．4） | 625.3 | （8．1） | 608.2 | （3．6） | 622.2 | （6．6） |
|  | Finland | 512.4 | （3．4） | 567.6 | （7．9） | 513.5 | （3．4） | C | c | 501.6 | （6．6） | 509.6 | （4．5） | 527.9 | （5．7） |
|  | France | 598.8 | （6．4） | 593.2 | （9．9） | 537.3 | （9．9） | 617.8 | （5．5） | 548.2 | （19．3） | 596.9 | （6．6） | 612.3 | （13．2） |
|  | Germany | 641.2 | （7．3） | 626.8 | （30．4） | 642.0 | （6．7） | 537.7 | （68．4） | c | c | 637.0 | （8．6） | 649.5 | （14．3） |
|  | Greece | 623.1 | （2．2） | C | c | c | c | 625.5 | （2．3） | 624.8 | （5．0） | 619.9 | （3．0） | 628.7 | （4．3） |
|  | Hungary | 509.3 | （5．6） | 521.9 | （18．6） | 586.4 | （11．3） | 502.4 | （5．8） | 522.8 | （48．9） | 515.6 | （7．0） | 503.5 | （9．3） |
|  | Iceland | 619.0 | （4．3） | C | c | 619.3 | （4．2） | C | c | 608.8 | （8．6） | 616.1 | （5．2） | 630.6 | （8．3） |
|  | Ireland | 516.0 | （4．0） | 513.9 | （5．1） | 532.2 | （2．5） | 486.5 | （6．5） | 521.9 | （5．3） | 518.0 | （5．0） | 504.1 | （6．1） |
|  | Israel | 629.5 | （5．6） | c | c | 631.4 | （13．8） | 628.1 | （5．9） | 603.9 | （15．5） | 643.7 | （7．5） | 622.7 | （10．5） |
|  | Italy | 646.7 | （3．0） | 628.3 | （21．6） | 809.1 | （20．0） | 643.6 | （2．9） | 646.7 | （23．2） | 645.8 | （3．9） | 644.3 | （5．2） |
|  | Japan | 583.0 | （6．6） | 657.3 | （16．4） | C | c | 604.9 | （6．3） | c | C | 561.0 | （14．0） | 621.7 | （8．6） |
|  | Korea | 620.7 | （14．6） | 612.9 | （11．6） | 510.5 | （9．6） | 623.3 | （9．8） | c | C | 614.4 | （19．4） | 617.6 | （10．5） |
|  | Luxembourg | 549.8 | （2．0） | 573.2 | （6．6） | 549.9 | （2．3） | 559.2 | （3．8） | C | c | 553.3 | （1．9） | C | C |
|  | Mexico | 735.2 | （4．2） | 734.8 | （13．8） | 753.8 | （6．7） | 723.6 | （5．0） | 712.8 | （10．4） | 740.1 | （5．5） | 735.9 | （6．5） |
|  | Netherlands | 498.1 | （10．4） | 499.0 | （8．4） | 515.2 | （7．5） | 469.2 | （9．5） | C | c | 495.8 | （7．5） | 506.3 | （12．7） |
|  | New Zealand | 726.3 | （5．9） | 824.1 | （61．6） | 633.4 | （12．8） | 738.1 | （6．6） | 710.7 | （20．7） | 708.0 | （7．7） | 748.4 | （10．2） |
|  | Norway | 553.6 | （4．5） | C | c | 554.1 | （4．4） | c | c | 547.5 | （8．2） | 550.4 | （6．3） | 571.2 | （11．0） |
|  | Poland | 584.9 | （3．8） | 653.6 | （13．8） | 586.6 | （3．6） | C | C | 574.0 | （8．1） | 588.9 | （4．0） | 601.9 | （7．2） |
|  | Portugal | 789.5 | （15．8） | 784.1 | （26．2） | 722.4 | （10．6） | 857.5 | （25．8） | 882.1 | （130．8） | 791.2 | （12．1） | 746.9 | （17．4） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 506.1 | （7．9） | 553.8 | （60．6） | 641.8 | （6．2） | 432.3 | （9．2） | 640.7 | （9．5） | 494.1 | （11．3） | 502.7 | （22．3） |
|  | Slovenia | 514.7 | （2．3） | 561.7 | （8．6） | c | c | 511.1 | （2．0） | 531.8 | （27．1） | 515.0 | （2．5） | 516.7 | （4．4） |
|  | Spain | 586.0 | （3．3） | 617.7 | （6．0） | 598.1 | （3．1） | C | c | 561.1 | （16．0） | 593.2 | （4．9） | 606.7 | （6．1） |
|  | Sweden | 550.2 | （4．9） | 531.3 | （36．4） | 545.2 | （6．2） | 666.1 | （51．6） | 536.8 | （9．1） | 546.8 | （10．3） | 556.7 | （11．3） |
|  | Switzerland | 572.8 | （5．2） | 623.4 | （48．4） | 589.9 | （5．7） | 526.1 | （13．5） | 607.5 | （18．9） | 576.4 | （6．6） | 558.1 | （18．2） |
|  | Turkey | 534.4 | （9．1） | c | c | 539.4 | （27．4） | 537.2 | （9．5） | 623.1 | （27．9） | 558.5 | （19．6） | 514.8 | （12．9） |
|  | United Kingdom | 738.0 | （7．7） | 755.2 | （12．5） | C | c | 746.2 | （6．5） | 770.4 | （24．8） | 734.6 | （7．5） | 766.7 | （16．9） |
|  | United States | 768.9 | （14．3） | 733.5 | （47．3） | 718.4 | （28．7） | 770.3 | （13．5） | 688.8 | （17．6） | 807.3 | （17．9） | 730.3 | （21．6） |
|  | OECD average | 631.7 | （1．4） | 644.5 | （4．7） | 641.1 | （3．7） | 636.0 | （3．5） | 643.7 | （5．6） | 632.0 | （1．7） | 635.5 | （2．0） |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 494.9 | （4．0） | 504.3 | （9．5） | 505.4 | （5．3） | 489.0 | （4．7） | 489.0 | （6．2） | 502.4 | （6．5） | 490.6 | （6．5） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{1}{3}$ | Argentina | 647.1 | （13．9） | 802.7 | （23．1） | 650.2 | （19．4） | 725.9 | （14．6） | 631.6 | （40．7） | 695.0 | （18．3） | 715.3 | （19．3） |
| ๔ | Brazil | 563.3 | （4．8） | 662.5 | （17．4） | 601.3 | （9．5） | 578.4 | （6．1） | 550.8 | （33．3） | 566.0 | （7．3） | 598.2 | （7．3） |
|  | Bulgaria | 530.0 | （5．2） | c | c | 648.9 | （25．0） | 527.3 | （5．0） | 603.3 | （25．3） | 531.9 | （6．5） | 522.6 | （8．8） |
|  | Colombia | 690.3 | （9．5） | 766.2 | （27．9） | 720.0 | （14．4） | 691.4 | （12．4） | 723.2 | （35．9） | 668.8 | （18．1） | 716.3 | （14．0） |
|  | Costa Rica | 583.2 | （4．8） | 689.1 | （19．8） | 605.2 | （4．6） | 584.6 | （9．7） | 605.2 | （9．4） | 590.3 | （6．4） | 611.6 | （20．4） |
|  | Croatia | 492.1 | （7．1） | C | C | C | c | 494.7 | （6．9） | c | c | 468.6 | （7．1） | 539.0 | （14．1） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 562.6 | （1．4） | 610.0 | （6．3） | 645.7 | （8．7） | 565.0 | （1．4） | 580.0 | （6．7） | 563.6 | （1．8） | 572.8 | （2．9） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 782.3 | （12．1） | 782.1 | （7．6） | 748.2 | （7．9） | 799.4 | （8．5） | c | c | c | c | 781.9 | （7．0） |
|  | Indonesia | 604.8 | （18．1） | 560.4 | （19．4） | 606.0 | （17．0） | 564.0 | （19．4） | 554.7 | （25．3） | 589.0 | （18．6） | 612.2 | （30．7） |
|  | Jordan | 764.8 | （4．9） | 782.6 | （10．3） | 767.8 | （4．4） | c | c | 772.9 | （13．6） | 764.6 | （7．1） | 770.0 | （6．3） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 496.5 | （10．7） | 561.4 | （37．6） | 476.3 | （9．5） | 556.4 | （21．5） | 489.8 | （11．6） | 484.9 | （19．2） | 510.4 | （20．7） |
|  | Latvia | 608.3 | （4．8） | c | c | 609.3 | （4．7） | 643.1 | （18．4） | 593.7 | （8．4） | 618.6 | （7．4） | 611.3 | （8．2） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 582.6 | （19．5） | C | C | 582.7 | （20．9） | c | c | C | c | 579.4 | （18．5） | c | C |
|  | Lithuania | 694.1 | （2．6） | C | C | 694.7 | （2．5） | C | C | 691.8 | （4．7） | 698.2 | （3．9） | 692.5 | （4．0） |
|  | Macao－China | c | C | 730.3 | （3．0） | 686.8 | （3．3） | 781.4 | （5．1） | c | c | c | c | 726.7 | （3．0） |
|  | Malaysia | 578.6 | （7．9） | 651.4 | （65．9） | 557.5 | （18．5） | 580.7 | （8．1） | 575.7 | （23．0） | 583.5 | （11．0） | 573.6 | （15．5） |
|  | Montenegro | 397.5 | （2．1） | c | c | C | c | 397.7 | （2．1） | c | C | 407.5 | （2．8） | 375.8 | （3．1） |
|  | Peru | 739.6 | （10．4） | 839.3 | （22．4） | 720.4 | （24．9） | 758.9 | （9．0） | 748.1 | （19．2） | 767.8 | （15．0） | 735.5 | （13．7） |
|  | Qatar | 722.7 | （2．6） | 781.1 | （4．0） | 781.1 | （6．4） | 737.0 | （2．3） | 749.8 | （7．2） | 722.0 | （3．5） | 761.8 | （3．7） |
|  | Romania | 512.5 | （6．7） | C | C | 513.1 | （6．7） | C | c | 538.8 | （15．4） | 501.6 | （9．1） | 526.3 | （14．2） |
|  | Russian Federation | 634.7 | （6．4） | c | C | 633.0 | （7．0） | 649.8 | （12．2） | 599.8 | （14．7） | 626.8 | （10．9） | 657.7 | （10．3） |
|  | Serbia | 450.8 | （5．3） | C | C | C | c | 450.9 | （4．9） | c | c | 449.4 | （7．4） | 453.8 | （6．8） |
|  | Shanghai－China | 763.2 | （10．6） | 845.9 | （49．4） | 965.6 | （15．2） | 629.1 | （8．0） | c | c | c | C | 770.9 | （9．5） |
|  | Singapore | 811.1 | （2．5） | c | c | 624.3 | （7．0） | 818.1 | （3．8） | c | C | C | C | 814.9 | （3．8） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 725.9 | （6．8） | 624.8 | （17．6） | 819.4 | （9．8） | 617.3 | （8．4） | C | C | 705.8 | （17．2） | 686.1 | （12．4） |
|  | Thailand | 628.0 | （8．2） | 507.1 | （22．7） | 558.5 | （8．0） | 622.6 | （9．1） | 658.0 | （21．6） | 584.3 | （11．8） | 624.4 | （18．3） |
|  | Tunisia | 741.2 | （9．3） | c | c | 669.3 | （12．1） | 776.8 | （12．3） | 722.3 | （47．8） | 743.2 | （11．0） | 731.8 | （17．8） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 921.8 | （10．7） | 862.2 | （10．5） | 734.3 | （13．2） | 909.6 | （7．0） | 900.2 | （28．2） | 909.8 | （14．5） | 873.3 | （8．0） |
|  | Uruguay | 439.7 | （6．8） | 460.5 | （19．2） | 444.9 | （9．6） | 443.2 | （7．8） | 424.1 | （19．1） | 440.8 | （9．4） | 451.4 | （9．8） |
|  | Viet Nam | 643.8 | （9．3） | 744.6 | （47．6） | 617.2 | （17．6） | 653.5 | （10．2） | 618.7 | （14．8） | 653.5 | （14．1） | 703.9 | （19．0） |

[^28][Part 1/1]
Percentage of students attending after-school lessons, by hours per week
Table IV.3.25 Results based on students' self-reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/1]
Hours of after-school study time per week
Table IV.3.27 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Average number of hours per week spent on the following, all school subjects combined: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Homework or other study set by teachers |  | Homework or other study set by teachers, with somebody overlooking and providing help if necessary, either at school or elsewhere |  | Work with a personal tutor whether paid or not |  | Attend after-school classes organised by a commercial company, and paid for by parents |  | Study with a parent or other family member |  | Work on a computer for practice (e.g. learn vocabulary with training software) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 6.0 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
| - | Austria | 4.5 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Belgium | 5.5 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Canada | 5.5 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Chile | 3.5 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 3.1 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Denmark | 4.3 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Estonia | 6.9 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.0) |
|  | Finland | 2.8 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) |
|  | France | 5.1 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Germany | 4.7 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Greece | 5.3 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Hungary | 6.2 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Iceland | 4.1 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 7.3 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Israel | 4.6 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Italy | 8.7 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 1.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Japan | 3.8 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Korea | 2.9 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.6 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 5.2 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.7 | (0.0) | 2.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Netherlands | 5.8 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 4.2 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Norway | 4.7 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Poland | 6.6 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 1.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 3.8 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 3.2 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.0) |
|  | Slovenia | 3.7 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Spain | 6.5 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Sweden | 3.6 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 4.0 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Turkey | 4.2 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 4.9 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | United States | 6.1 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | OECD average | 4.9 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Albania | 5.1 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Argentina | 3.7 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 2.1 | (0.1) |
| む | Brazil | 3.3 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 5.6 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Colombia | 5.3 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 3.5 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Croatia | 5.9 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Cyprus* | 3.8 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 2.0 | (0.0) | 2.2 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.0 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 4.9 | (0.2) | 3.2 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Jordan | 4.2 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 8.8 | (0.2) | 4.1 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 3.4 | (0.1) | 4.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Latvia | 6.2 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 3.3 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Lithuania | 6.7 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 5.9 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 4.8 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.0) | 2.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Montenegro | 4.3 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 5.5 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Qatar | 4.3 | (0.0) | 1.7 | (0.0) | 1.7 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 1.6 | (0.0) |
|  | Romania | 7.3 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 9.7 | (0.2) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Serbia | 4.4 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 13.8 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Singapore | 9.4 | (0.2) | 2.4 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 5.3 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.0) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Thailand | 5.6 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.0) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 2.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 3.5 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (0.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 6.2 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 4.7 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Viet Nam | 5.8 | (0.2) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink (inाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 1/1]
Additional mathematics lessons at school
Table IV.3.29 Results based on school principals' reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink 可int http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 1/1]
Extracurricular activities at school


|  | Albania |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brgentina |  |
| Colombia |  |
| Costa Rica |  |
| Croatia |  |
| Cyprus* |  |
| Hong Kong-China |  |
| Indonesia |  |
| Jordan |  |
| Kazakhstan |  |
| Latvia |  |
| Liechtenstein |  |
| Lithuania |  |
| Macao-China |  |
| Malaysia |  |
| Montenegro |  |
| Peru |  |
| Qatar |  |
| Romania |  |
| Russian Federation |  |
| Serbia |  |
| Shanghai-China |  |
| Singapore |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  |
| Thailand |  |
| Tunisia |  |
| United Arab Emirates |  |
| Uruguay |  |
| Viet Nam |  |


| 45.0 | (4.0) | 61.6 | (3.7) | 39.1 | (4.1) | 68.9 | (3.6) | 67.3 | (3.6) | 90.9 | (2.3) | 19.0 | (2.9) | 48.2 | (4.2) | 78.6 | (3.6) | 91.0 | (2.2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26.6 | (2.9) | 33.2 | (3.6) | 29.6 | (3.4) | 50.6 | (3.4) | 41.1 | (3.6) | 42.1 | (4.0) | 16.9 | (3.0) | 51.4 | (4.1) | 46.1 | (3.5) | 82.7 | (3.5) |
| 23.0 | (2.4) | 57.8 | (2.7) | 23.6 | 5) | 44.8 | (2.8) | 8.3 | (1.4) | 92.4 | .4) | 24.1 | (2.5) | 17.5 | (2.1) | 45 | (3.0) | 90.8 | 8) |
| 49.2 | (3.6) | 51.5 | (4.0) | 69.2 | (3.5) | 89.7 | (2.3) | 36.1 | (3.8) | 79.9 | (2.8) | 22.5 | (3.4) | 58.2 | (3.6) | 61.7 | (3.6) | 99.0 | (0.7) |
| 51.8 | (3.9) | 54.0 | (3.8) | 46.0 | (4.0) | 96.3 | (1.4) | 28.9 | (3.4) | 60.7 | (3.9) | 21.8 | (3.0) | 24.0 | (3.2) | 68.0 | (3.6) | 96.3 | (1.3) |
| 83.3 | (2. | 75 | (3.2) | 15.2 | (2.4) | 39.1 | (3.5) | 32.1 | (3.0) | 61 | (3.4) | 27.1 | (3.3) | 21.9 | (3.0) | 75.6 | ) | 5.9 | 7) |
| 44.7 | (3.9) | 62.3 | (3.8) | 66.2 | (3.8) | 95.1 | (1.5) | 20.4 | (3.1) | 71.5 | (2.8) | 16.2 | (2.9) | 39.7 | (3.9) | 48.1 | (3.7) | 99.3 | (0.5) |
| 98.2 | (0.0) | 89.8 | .1) | 95.9 | 0.0) | 99.9 | .0) | 48.4 | (0.1) | 93.6 | (0.1) | 48.4 | (0.1) | 82.7 | (0.1) | 91.3 | (0.1) | 97.5 | 0) |
| 92.8 | (2.) | 86.0 | (2.8) | 88 | 9) | 100.0 | c |  | 6) | 91.0 | (2.6) | 78 | (3.5) | 96.9 | 4) | 98 | (1) | 100.0 | c |
| 50.5 | (4.0) | 53.6 | (4.5) | 40.4 | (4.1) | 93.1 | (2.1) | 37. | (3.9) | 67.8 | (3.8) | 23.7 | (3.8) | 45.6 | (3.9) | 61.4 | (4.5) | 92.8 | (2.2) |
| 25.3 | (3.4) | 54.0 | (3.1) | 62.6 | (3) | . 2 | 8) | 33.2 | (3 | 38.5 | (3) | 43.0 | (3.3) | 44.5 | (3.3) | 54.7 | (3.6) | 92.4 | (1.8) |
| 62.6 | (3.5) | 51.3 | (4.1) | 8 | (3.0) | 97.1 | (1.5) | 63 | (3.6) | 97 | (1.1) | 71 | (3.6) | 63.8 | (3.8) | 89.3 | (2.5) | 99.1 | (0.8) |
| 76.4 | (2.8) | 66.9 | (3.6) | 60.4 | (3.5) | 89.3 | (2.3) | 35.3 | (3.6) | 91.6 | (1.7) | 16.3 | (2.5) | 29.4 | (3.4) | 90.8 | (2.1) | 95.0 | (1.7) |
| 78.5 | (0.8 | 59.6 | (0.8) | 32.5 | (1.0) | 74.1 | (0.8 | 2.9 | (0.0 | 34.1 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 29.0 | .0) | 72.2 | (0.8) | 100.0 | c |
| 92.3 | (1.7) | 58 | .0) | 66.2 | .9) | . 6 | 1) | 19.7 | (2.5) | 93.2 | 1.8) | 12.5 | (2.5) | 34.1 | (3.4) | 87.9 | (2.2) | 98.1 | 0.9) |
| 87.5 | (0.0) | 96.1 | (0.0) | 88.8 | (0.0) | 99.8 | (0.0) | 61.6 | (0.1) | 87.8 | (0.0) | 50.2 | (0.1) | 76.5 | (0.0) | 94.1 | (0.0) | 99.9 | (0.0) |
| 42.3 | (3.5 | 41.8 | (3.7) | 90.0 | (2.5 | 79.3 | (3 | 96. | (1.5) | 80.4 | (3) | 89 | (2. | 86.0 | (2.7) | 93.6 | ) | 99.3 | (0.7) |
| 38.5 | (0.2) | 86 | (0.1) | 89.1 | (0.2) | 81.7 | 1) | 40. | (3) | 54 | (1) | 30 | (0.1) | 69 | (0.1) | 62. | (0.1) | 95.3 | (0.1) |
| 55.3 | (3.7) | 59. | (3) | 38.9 | (3.3 | 47.0 | (3.4) | 30.1 | (3.3) | 80.8 | (2.6) | 31.5 | (3.2) | 31.4 | (3.3) | 61.4 | (3.5) | 87.7 | (2.1) |
| 28.3 | (0.1) | 77.7 | (0.1) | 89.4 | (0.1) | 97.8 | (0.0) | 72.1 | (0.1) | 91.5 | (0.0) | 36.2 | (0.1) | 72.5 | (0.1) | 79.8 | (0.1) | 100.0 | (0.0) |
| 51.2 | (3.8) | 56.2 | (3.9) | 79.7 | (2.9) | 73.6 | (4) | 43.5 | (3.8) | 68 | (3.6) | 52.9 | (3.5) | 49 | (3.9) | 63.0 | (3.5) | 70.1 | (3.4) |
| 66.2 | (2.9) | 40.3 | (3.6) | 74.5 | (3.3 | 92.8 | (1.7) | 65.6 | (3.3) | 96.6 | (1.1) | 33.3 | (3.3) | 51.2 | (3.1) | 65.1 | (3.9) | 99.9 | (0.1) |
| 69.9 | (3.9) | 81.0 | (3.4) | 56.2 | (4.2) | 76.3 | (3.7) | 18.4 | (3.4) | 75.1 | (3.5) | 30.1 | (4.0) | 46.1 | (4.2) | 50.7 | (4.8) | 98.8 | (0.8) |
| 74.4 | (3.1) | 67 | (3.8) | 78.2 | (3.0) | 95.4 | (1.8) | 68 | (3.3) | 67.3 | (2.6) | 61.0 | (4.0) | 69.7 | (3.6) | 86.7 | (2.5) | 99.4 | (0.6) |
| 98.0 | (0.0) | 70.3 | (0.3) | 92.8 | 1) | 100.0 | c | 20.7 | (0.6) | 86.9 | (0.1) | 27 | .6) | 94.8 | (0.7) | 85.9 | (0.2) | 99.7 | (0.0) |
| 74.1 | (3.4) | 49.7 | (3.9) | 91.1 | (2.1) | 91.1 | (2.1) | 41.7 | (4.5) | 59.2 | (3.4) | 56.4 | (3.8) | 67.8 | (3.6) | 88.6 | (2.8) | 95.3 | (1.9) |
| 67.6 | (2.9) | 72.4 | (1) | 83.2 | ) | 90.9 | (1.7) | 79.7 | (2.2) | 53.2 | (3.6) | 44.3 | (3.8) | 90.9 | (2.1) | 87.1 | (2.1) | 100.0 | (0.0) |
| 32.6 | (4.3) | 54.9 | (4.0) | 59.6 | (4.3) | 82.7 | (3.0) | 52.1 | (4.0) | 56.0 | (4.1) | 40.9 | (3.7) | 59.3 | (3.9) | 62.2 | (4.4) | 86.0 | (2.7) |
| 21.5 | (1.6) | 63.7 | (2.1) | 79.4 | (2.1) | 79.6 | (1.7) | 57.9 | (2.6) | 86.4 | (1.6) | 33.3 | (2.1) | 64.9 | (2.7) | 67.7 | (2.2) | 96.4 | (0.8) |
| 69.9 | (2.9) | 52.1 | (3.8) | 11.9 | (2.4) | 35.5 | (2.9) | 6.1 | (1.6) | 25.8 | (3.1) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 24.0 | (3.3) | 27.4 | (3.5) | 92.7 | (1.9) |
| 18.2 | (3.5) | 85.0 | (2.7) | 50.1 | (3.1) | 84.4 | (2.7) | 26.5 | (3.6) | 82.3 | (2.8) | 21.5 | (3.2) | 16.6 | (3.0) | 47.1 | (4.0) | 99.1 | (0.7) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 1/2]
Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance
Table IV.3.31 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of creative extracurricular activities at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| O Australia | 2.18 | (0.03) | 1.10 | (0.09) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.62 | (0.07) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.82 | (0.03) |
| Austria | 1.12 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.55 | (0.10) | 1.55 | (0.13) | 2.37 | (0.10) | 1.01 | (0.04) |
| Belgium | 1.22 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.94 | (0.10) | 1.61 | (0.12) | 2.34 | (0.07) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
| Canada | 2.68 | (0.02) | 1.72 | (0.06) | 2.99 | (0.06) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.62 | (0.02) |
| Chile | 1.94 | (0.07) | 0.77 | (0.08) | 1.67 | (0.14) | 2.32 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Czech Republic | 1.16 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.70 | (0.13) | 1.47 | (0.14) | 2.49 | (0.08) | 1.02 | (0.03) |
| Denmark | 1.14 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.59 | (0.13) | 1.44 | (0.13) | 2.53 | (0.10) | 1.04 | (0.04) |
| Estonia | 2.09 | (0.05) | 0.86 | (0.13) | 2.00 | (0.01) | 2.50 | (0.11) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| Finland | 1.59 | (0.07) | 0.48 | (0.11) | 1.17 | (0.15) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.71 | (0.11) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| France | 1.96 | (0.06) | 0.83 | (0.06) | 1.84 | (0.14) | 2.19 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| Germany | 2.26 | (0.06) | 1.03 | (0.17) | 2.00 | (0.10) | 3.00 | (0.08) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.05) |
| Greece | 1.41 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.10) | 1.80 | (0.15) | 2.87 | (0.12) | 1.09 | (0.04) |
| Hungary | 1.84 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.11) | 1.73 | (0.13) | 2.13 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.01) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
| Iceland | 1.87 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.01) | 1.70 | (0.01) | 2.06 | (0.01) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.00) |
| Ireland | 1.56 | (0.07) | 0.46 | (0.11) | 1.14 | (0.15) | 2.00 | (0.02) | 2.65 | (0.12) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Israel | 1.63 | (0.07) | 0.31 | (0.10) | 1.19 | (0.14) | 2.03 | (0.09) | 3.00 | (0.04) | 1.05 | (0.04) |
| Italy | 1.37 | (0.03) | 0.22 | (0.06) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.78 | (0.07) | 2.47 | (0.05) | 0.93 | (0.02) |
| Japan | 2.23 | (0.05) | 1.29 | (0.12) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.62 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.76 | (0.04) |
| Korea | 2.06 | (0.07) | 0.82 | (0.17) | 2.00 | (0.04) | 2.41 | (0.16) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.05) |
| Luxembourg | 2.32 | (0.00) | 1.13 | (0.00) | 2.16 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 1.82 | (0.04) | 0.48 | (0.05) | 1.52 | (0.08) | 2.30 | (0.07) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.03 | (0.02) |
| Netherlands | 1.85 | (0.08) | 0.51 | (0.10) | 1.63 | (0.15) | 2.26 | (0.15) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.04) |
| New Zealand | 2.66 | (0.04) | 1.79 | (0.07) | 2.86 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.57 | (0.04) |
| Norway | 0.68 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.12) | 1.00 | (0.05) | 1.66 | (0.13) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
| Poland | 2.51 | (0.04) | 1.74 | (0.08) | 2.30 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.62 | (0.03) |
| Portugal | 1.36 | (0.07) | 0.32 | (0.12) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.73 | (0.17) | 2.38 | (0.09) | 0.87 | (0.04) |
| Slovak Republic | 1.34 | (0.09) | 0.00 | (0.06) | 0.98 | (0.12) | 1.76 | (0.17) | 2.64 | (0.12) | 1.03 | (0.04) |
| Slovenia | 2.19 | (0.01) | 0.94 | (0.02) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.80 | (0.03) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.00) |
| Spain | 0.95 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.11) | 1.08 | (0.07) | 2.17 | (0.03) | 0.87 | (0.02) |
| Sweden | 1.43 | (0.07) | 0.34 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.84 | (0.15) | 2.56 | (0.08) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Switzerland | 1.96 | (0.06) | 0.63 | (0.08) | 1.78 | (0.11) | 2.42 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| Turkey | 1.71 | (0.08) | 0.39 | (0.12) | 1.25 | (0.15) | 2.19 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.05 | (0.03) |
| United Kingdom | 2.75 | (0.04) | 2.01 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.55 | (0.05) |
| United States | 2.66 | (0.05) | 1.73 | (0.12) | 2.92 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.61 | (0.06) |
| OECD average | 1.81 | (0.01) | 0.68 | (0.02) | 1.56 | (0.02) | 2.20 | (0.02) | 2.79 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.01) |
| Albania | 1.83 | (0.07) | 0.64 | (0.08) | 1.43 | (0.15) | 2.25 | (0.15) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| Argentina | 1.04 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.59 | (0.16) | 1.19 | (0.11) | 2.40 | (0.09) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| © Brazil | 1.25 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.07) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 1.65 | (0.12) | 2.36 | (0.07) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
| Bulgaria | 1.61 | (0.08) | 0.18 | (0.12) | 1.17 | (0.16) | 2.08 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.02) | 1.09 | (0.03) |
| Colombia | 1.69 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.11) | 1.34 | (0.16) | 2.04 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.06) | 1.02 | (0.04) |
| Costa Rica | 2.31 | (0.06) | 1.10 | (0.15) | 2.16 | (0.15) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.05) |
| Croatia | 1.54 | (0.08) | 0.19 | (0.13) | 1.00 | (0.08) | 1.97 | (0.15) | 2.99 | (0.09) | 1.07 | (0.04) |
| Cyprus* | 2.78 | (0.00) | 2.10 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.48 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 2.77 | (0.04) | 2.08 | (0.15) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.48 | (0.05) |
| Indonesia | 1.65 | (0.10) | 0.05 | (0.12) | 1.17 | (0.20) | 2.38 | (0.16) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.18 | (0.04) |
| Jordan | 1.32 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.12) | 1.82 | (0.14) | 2.63 | (0.11) | 1.06 | (0.04) |
| Kazakhstan | 2.02 | (0.06) | 0.79 | (0.06) | 1.91 | (0.11) | 2.37 | (0.16) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
| Latvia | 2.33 | (0.05) | 1.43 | (0.10) | 2.00 | (0.02) | 2.91 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.72 | (0.03) |
| Liechtenstein | 2.05 | (0.02) | c | c | - | c | c | c | c | c | 1.12 | (0.01) |
| Lithuania | 2.35 | (0.05) | 1.43 | (0.10) | 2.00 | (0.05) | 2.96 | (0.10) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.74 | (0.04) |
| Macao-China | 2.78 | (0.00) | 2.11 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.61 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 1.76 | (0.07) | 0.76 | (0.07) | 1.09 | (0.13) | 2.18 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.03) |
| Montenegro | 1.88 | (0.00) | 0.76 | (0.00) | 1.52 | (0.00) | 2.25 | (0.01) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 1.71 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.09) | 1.29 | (0.14) | 2.02 | (0.09) | 3.00 | (0.07) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
| Qatar | 1.83 | (0.00) | 0.74 | (0.00) | 1.54 | (0.00) | 2.05 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.00) |
| Romania | 1.70 | (0.07) | 0.57 | (0.10) | 1.45 | (0.14) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.79 | (0.13) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Russian Federation | 1.71 | (0.07) | 0.50 | (0.09) | 1.38 | (0.15) | 2.00 | (0.05) | 2.96 | (0.10) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| Serbia | 2.00 | (0.08) | 0.77 | (0.08) | 1.76 | (0.15) | 2.46 | (0.17) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Shanghai-China | 2.27 | (0.06) | 1.05 | (0.16) | 2.04 | (0.11) | 3.00 | (0.06) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.05) |
| Singapore | 2.47 | (0.01) | 1.72 | (0.00) | 2.18 | (0.02) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.65 | (0.00) |
| Chinese Taipei | 2.08 | (0.07) | 0.78 | (0.15) | 2.00 | (0.06) | 2.56 | (0.16) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
| Thailand | 2.26 | (0.06) | 0.77 | (0.11) | 2.29 | (0.16) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| Tunisia | 1.43 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.12) | 1.00 | (0.05) | 1.89 | (0.15) | 2.77 | (0.14) | 1.05 | (0.04) |
| United Arab Emirates | 1.51 | (0.04) | 0.29 | (0.08) | 1.08 | (0.09) | 2.00 | (0.01) | 2.65 | (0.05) | 0.96 | (0.02) |
| Uruguay | 1.48 | (0.07) | 0.30 | (0.10) | 1.02 | (0.08) | 2.00 | (0.09) | 2.62 | (0.12) | 0.96 | (0.04) |
| Viet Nam | 1.50 | (0.06) | 0.65 | (0.09) | 1.00 | (0.02) | 1.90 | (0.15) | 2.46 | (0.11) | 0.81 | (0.04) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 2/2]
Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance
Table IV.3.31 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 487 | (3.7) | 500 | (3.8) | 513 | (3.0) | 519 | (3.4) | 16.4 | (2.54) | 1.3 | (0.07) | 2.0 | (0.59) |
| ư | Austria | 472 | (5.5) | 499 | (7.4) | 524 | (5.4) | 528 | (7.0) | 22.6 | (3.92) | 1.8 | (0.17) | 6.0 | (2.06) |
|  | Belgium | 484 | (7.8) | 520 | (7.2) | 527 | (5.6) | 532 | (7.4) | 18.8 | (4.84) | 1.6 | (0.20) | 3.0 | (1.56) |
|  | Canada | 510 | (3.2) | 520 | (4.1) | 521 | (4.2) | 521 | (2.9) | 9.7 | (2.49) | 1.2 | (0.07) | 0.5 | (0.23) |
|  | Chile | 405 | (6.3) | 414 | (5.9) | 427 | (6.1) | 445 | (6.0) | 17.1 | (3.77) | 1.4 | (0.15) | 3.7 | (1.61) |
|  | Czech Republic | 488 | (6.1) | 483 | (7.6) | 496 | (8.4) | 527 | (7.9) | 16.6 | (3.87) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 3.1 | (1.41) |
|  | Denmark | 501 | (4.9) | 501 | (4.4) | 498 | (4.1) | 502 | (5.1) | 0.7 | (2.52) | 1.0 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (0.11) |
|  | Estonia | 506 | (4.5) | 525 | (4.4) | 524 | (3.5) | 525 | (3.8) | 9.8 | (2.59) | 1.3 | (0.14) | 1.1 | (0.62) |
|  | Finland | 514 | (5.2) | 517 | (4.9) | 523 | (4.0) | 519 | (2.7) | 2.6 | (2.30) | 1.1 | (0.09) | 0.1 | (0.16) |
|  | France | 498 | (8.0) | 503 | (6.8) | 499 | (6.2) | 486 | (10.2) | -6.0 | (6.11) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.3 | (0.58) |
|  | Germany | 469 | (7.5) | 497 | (9.1) | 543 | (7.8) | 545 | (6.9) | 35.0 | (5.07) | 2.1 | (0.29) | 10.2 | (2.65) |
|  | Greece | 448 | (5.4) | 455 | (6.1) | 447 | (7.8) | 462 | (6.3) | 3.9 | (2.99) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.2 | (0.40) |
|  | Hungary | 443 | (6.2) | 479 | (6.4) | 485 | (7.8) | 503 | (11.0) | 24.9 | (4.28) | 1.9 | (0.21) | 6.6 | (2.27) |
|  | Iceland | 490 | (3.7) | 493 | (3.1) | 493 | (3.3) | 498 | (3.6) | 4.2 | (1.92) | 1.1 | (0.09) | 0.2 | (0.15) |
|  | Ireland | 502 | (5.9) | 504 | (5.9) | 501 | (6.4) | 503 | (5.6) | 0.2 | (3.65) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.15) |
|  | Israel | 419 | (9.9) | 464 | (8.9) | 481 | (9.5) | 500 | (7.3) | 30.3 | (3.95) | 2.2 | (0.26) | 9.1 | (2.35) |
|  | Italy | 473 | (4.6) | 484 | (4.8) | 494 | (3.8) | 498 | (4.4) | 11.1 | (2.80) | 1.2 | (0.11) | 1.2 | (0.65) |
|  | Japan | 502 | (7.7) | 531 | (7.7) | 550 | (6.6) | 562 | (6.1) | 36.3 | (5.53) | 1.8 | (0.21) | 8.6 | (2.64) |
|  | Korea | 540 | (10.9) | 543 | (7.8) | 557 | (8.0) | 575 | (7.4) | 17.0 | (5.84) | 1.4 | (0.23) | 2.3 | (1.64) |
|  | Luxembourg | 465 | (2.8) | 506 | (2.9) | 494 | (2.7) | 494 | (3.3) | 16.1 | (1.04) | 1.5 | (0.08) | 2.2 | (0.29) |
|  | Mexico | 399 | (2.8) | 407 | (2.6) | 419 | (2.4) | 429 | (3.1) | 11.5 | (1.65) | 1.4 | (0.08) | 2.5 | (0.71) |
|  | Netherlands | 485 | (10.9) | 522 | (9.4) | 537 | (7.5) | 535 | (9.4) | 21.7 | (5.75) | 1.9 | (0.29) | 5.6 | (3.17) |
|  | New Zealand | 470 | (6.9) | 510 | (8.2) | 514 | (5.2) | 513 | (5.2) | 32.6 | (7.39) | 1.8 | (0.19) | 3.5 | (1.55) |
|  | Norway | 487 | (4.5) | 488 | (5.0) | 492 | (5.3) | 494 | (5.4) | 4.1 | (3.59) | 1.1 | (0.10) | 0.1 | (0.22) |
|  | Poland | 515 | (6.1) | 519 | (5.5) | 518 | (5.3) | 517 | (5.4) | 1.5 | (5.52) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.12) |
|  | Portugal | 488 | (6.9) | 478 | (7.6) | 489 | (6.5) | 493 | (7.0) | 3.2 | (3.95) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.1 | (0.25) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 484 | (10.6) | 477 | (10.8) | 481 | (8.3) | 486 | (9.9) | 1.6 | (6.20) | 0.9 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.41) |
|  | Slovenia | 469 | (2.6) | 484 | (2.4) | 525 | (5.1) | 536 | (4.0) | 32.3 | (1.47) | 1.7 | (0.11) | 9.6 | (0.83) |
|  | Spain | 485 | (3.0) | 484 | (3.5) | 483 | (3.8) | 488 | (4.0) | 1.3 | (1.92) | 1.0 | (0.08) | 0.0 | (0.05) |
|  | Sweden | 476 | (4.8) | 474 | (4.6) | 478 | (5.0) | 485 | (4.8) | 3.7 | (2.97) | 1.1 | (0.09) | 0.1 | (0.23) |
|  | Switzerland | 525 | (6.3) | 527 | (5.4) | 533 | (5.8) | 543 | (7.4) | 6.8 | (4.12) | 1.1 | (0.14) | 0.5 | (0.67) |
|  | Turkey | 421 | (6.0) | 443 | (10.5) | 463 | (8.7) | 468 | (9.8) | 18.8 | (4.00) | 1.4 | (0.13) | 4.7 | (2.05) |
|  | United Kingdom | 481 | (5.7) | 500 | (6.4) | 498 | (7.3) | 501 | (5.7) | 18.7 | (6.44) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 1.1 | (0.82) |
|  | United States | 450 | (8.5) | 492 | (6.3) | 493 | (5.6) | 494 | (4.8) | 35.4 | (5.12) | 1.8 | (0.22) | 5.7 | (1.72) |
|  | OECD average | 478 | (1.1) | 492 | (1.1) | 501 | (1.0) | 507 | (1.1) | 14.1 | (0.72) | 1.4 | (0.03) | 2.8 | (0.23) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 387 | (3.7) | 391 | (5.1) | 393 | (5.7) | 398 | (3.7) | 5.1 | (2.02) | 1.1 | (0.08) | 0.3 | (0.24) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | Argentina | 390 | (6.8) | 392 | (5.6) | 387 | (6.4) | 386 | (5.8) | -0.5 | (3.58) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.21) |
| ส | Brazil | 386 | (3.6) | 400 | (5.1) | 400 | (3.8) | 405 | (4.8) | 7.4 | (2.34) | 1.2 | (0.10) | 0.8 | (0.53) |
|  | Bulgaria | 419 | (9.0) | 425 | (10.4) | 457 | (9.0) | 464 | (9.6) | 17.6 | (5.34) | 1.5 | (0.21) | 4.3 | (2.58) |
|  | Colombia | 365 | (5.8) | 377 | (5.5) | 381 | (5.6) | 389 | (5.9) | 8.8 | (3.11) | 1.4 | (0.15) | 1.5 | (1.03) |
|  | Costa Rica | 399 | (7.3) | 404 | (7.1) | 411 | (5.1) | 413 | (5.7) | 6.3 | (4.38) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 0.6 | (0.69) |
|  | Croatia | 435 | (7.3) | 469 | (10.8) | 474 | (7.1) | 506 | (7.8) | 23.3 | (3.81) | 1.8 | (0.22) | 7.9 | (2.79) |
|  | Cyprus* | 410 | (2.2) | 449 | (2.9) | 450 | (3.4) | 448 | (3.1) | 33.0 | (2.40) | 1.8 | (0.09) | 2.8 | (0.41) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 537 | (7.7) | 569 | (5.1) | 567 | (5.2) | 572 | (5.5) | 32.4 | (8.29) | 1.5 | (0.20) | 2.6 | (1.36) |
|  | Indonesia | 342 | (6.6) | 363 | (6.3) | 390 | (7.6) | 408 | (8.2) | 22.4 | (3.36) | 2.1 | (0.28) | 13.7 | (3.16) |
|  | Jordan | 370 | (5.3) | 376 | (6.4) | 388 | (5.2) | 408 | (8.8) | 14.7 | (3.58) | 1.4 | (0.14) | 4.0 | (1.84) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 439 | (6.4) | 432 | (5.9) | 429 | (4.4) | 425 | (5.3) | -6.1 | (3.71) | 0.8 | (0.11) | 0.6 | (0.72) |
|  | Latvia | 479 | (5.9) | 482 | (5.9) | 498 | (6.0) | 501 | (4.5) | 13.6 | (4.24) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 1.4 | (0.91) |
|  | Liechtenstein | C | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | 35.6 | (3.93) | 2.6 | (0.71) | 17.6 | (3.48) |
|  | Lithuania | 459 | (4.7) | 470 | (5.9) | 491 | (5.4) | 495 | (5.2) | 20.9 | (4.13) | 1.5 | (0.14) | 3.0 | (1.19) |
|  | Macao-China | 513 | (2.5) | 548 | (2.9) | 546 | (4.2) | 546 | (4.1) | 31.0 | (1.53) | 1.6 | (0.07) | 4.0 | (0.37) |
|  | Malaysia | 408 | (5.3) | 408 | (4.5) | 424 | (6.7) | 443 | (7.8) | 15.1 | (4.09) | 1.2 | (0.13) | 3.1 | (1.57) |
|  | Montenegro | 393 | (2.4) | 401 | (3.8) | 413 | (4.0) | 436 | (3.4) | 18.4 | (1.39) | 1.3 | (0.10) | 4.3 | (0.60) |
|  | Peru | 349 | (6.0) | 358 | (5.3) | 362 | (6.6) | 404 | (9.4) | 20.3 | (4.12) | 1.4 | (0.15) | 5.5 | (2.09) |
|  | Qatar | 346 | (1.9) | 356 | (2.0) | 364 | (2.0) | 440 | (1.6) | 37.3 | (0.84) | 1.4 | (0.08) | 11.1 | (0.44) |
|  | Romania | 434 | (8.3) | 435 | (7.3) | 451 | (5.8) | 457 | (8.5) | 10.6 | (5.53) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 1.4 | (1.43) |
|  | Russian Federation | 465 | (4.6) | 476 | (5.1) | 481 | (5.7) | 506 | (6.4) | 15.4 | (3.00) | 1.3 | (0.13) | 3.0 | (1.13) |
|  | Serbia | 431 | (7.6) | 441 | (7.3) | 455 | (7.6) | 468 | (9.3) | 15.0 | (5.32) | 1.2 | (0.18) | 2.4 | (1.62) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 577 | (8.3) | 596 | (8.8) | 638 | (6.0) | 639 | (5.6) | 32.0 | (4.41) | 1.8 | (0.18) | 7.8 | (2.20) |
|  | Singapore | 553 | (3.8) | 564 | (3.6) | 591 | (3.5) | 590 | (3.7) | 27.3 | (1.87) | 1.3 | (0.08) | 2.8 | (0.38) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 537 | (7.8) | 554 | (10.1) | 568 | (6.5) | 580 | (8.4) | 18.0 | (5.14) | 1.4 | (0.15) | 2.0 | (1.14) |
|  | Thailand | 401 | (5.6) | 420 | (7.1) | 443 | (6.0) | 444 | (5.9) | 19.1 | (3.12) | 1.6 | (0.19) | 5.0 | (1.65) |
|  | Tunisia | 383 | (6.6) | 383 | (7.6) | 392 | (9.6) | 393 | (10.2) | 4.2 | (4.68) | 1.0 | (0.18) | 0.3 | (0.77) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 416 | (5.0) | 423 | (4.2) | 442 | (5.8) | 482 | (4.2) | 27.5 | (2.45) | 1.4 | (0.13) | 9.1 | (1.50) |
|  | Uruguay | 400 | (8.0) | 407 | (5.8) | 421 | (7.4) | 411 | (6.8) | 4.9 | (4.59) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 0.3 | (0.53) |
|  | Viet Nam | 499 | (7.5) | 503 | (9.5) | 512 | (7.7) | 531 | (7.5) | 16.7 | (5.45) | 1.3 | (0.15) | 2.5 | (1.66) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV.3.32 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 2.64 | (0.06) | 0.92 | (0.06) | 2.23 | (0.11) | 3.11 | (0.08) | 4.31 | (0.04) | 1.30 | (0.03) |
| Austria | 1.14 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.79 | (0.14) | 1.25 | (0.13) | 2.52 | (0.13) | 1.04 | (0.07) |
| Belgium | 1.61 | (0.06) | 0.37 | (0.07) | 1.08 | (0.11) | 2.00 | (0.03) | 3.00 | (0.14) | 1.06 | (0.04) |
| Canada | 2.67 | (0.07) | 0.77 | (0.09) | 2.11 | (0.10) | 3.25 | (0.09) | 4.55 | (0.07) | 1.46 | (0.03) |
| Chile | 2.01 | (0.11) | 0.44 | (0.11) | 1.63 | (0.13) | 2.28 | (0.15) | 3.70 | (0.15) | 1.30 | (0.06) |
| Czech Republic | 2.34 | (0.10) | 0.84 | (0.04) | 1.73 | (0.14) | 2.63 | (0.14) | 4.15 | (0.18) | 1.32 | (0.05) |
| Denmark | 0.87 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.26 | (0.15) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 2.20 | (0.17) | 0.95 | (0.05) |
| Estonia | 2.74 | (0.07) | 1.15 | (0.11) | 2.12 | (0.11) | 3.23 | (0.09) | 4.45 | (0.07) | 1.31 | (0.04) |
| Finland | 2.16 | (0.07) | 0.79 | (0.06) | 1.80 | (0.13) | 2.67 | (0.12) | 3.36 | (0.09) | 1.06 | (0.05) |
| France | 2.08 | (0.07) | 0.56 | (0.08) | 1.60 | (0.12) | 2.53 | (0.12) | 3.62 | (0.12) | 1.25 | (0.05) |
| Germany | 2.32 | (0.10) | 0.68 | (0.08) | 1.85 | (0.11) | 2.56 | (0.12) | 4.20 | (0.20) | 1.38 | (0.06) |
| Greece | 1.45 | (0.08) | 0.54 | (0.09) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.21 | (0.13) | 3.05 | (0.18) | 1.13 | (0.07) |
| Hungary | 3.39 | (0.11) | 1.28 | (0.17) | 3.16 | (0.24) | 4.12 | (0.13) | 5.00 | (0.01) | 1.47 | (0.07) |
| Iceland | 1.81 | (0.01) | 0.56 | (0.01) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 2.17 | (0.02) | 3.52 | (0.01) | 1.24 | (0.00) |
| Ireland | 1.81 | (0.11) | 0.29 | (0.13) | 1.18 | (0.15) | 2.22 | (0.15) | 3.54 | (0.14) | 1.31 | (0.07) |
| Israel | 2.35 | (0.10) | 0.73 | (0.19) | 2.00 | (0.03) | 2.74 | (0.15) | 3.92 | (0.14) | 1.24 | (0.05) |
| Italy | 2.45 | (0.05) | 1.05 | (0.10) | 2.16 | (0.10) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.60 | (0.05) | 1.08 | (0.03) |
| Japan | 2.02 | (0.08) | 0.56 | (0.11) | 1.70 | (0.13) | 2.40 | (0.12) | 3.43 | (0.11) | 1.17 | (0.06) |
| Korea | 4.08 | (0.08) | 2.32 | (0.17) | 4.01 | (0.15) | 5.00 | (0.07) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.17 | (0.07) |
| Luxembourg | 2.49 | (0.00) | 1.48 | (0.00) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.47 | (0.00) | 4.01 | (0.00) | 1.09 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 2.42 | (0.05) | 0.70 | (0.03) | 1.79 | (0.05) | 2.86 | (0.07) | 4.33 | (0.10) | 1.42 | (0.03) |
| Netherlands | 1.24 | (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.03) | 1.42 | (0.17) | 2.49 | (0.12) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
| New Zealand | 3.23 | (0.09) | 1.68 | (0.17) | 3.00 | (0.02) | 3.71 | (0.16) | 4.52 | (0.14) | 1.15 | (0.06) |
| Norway | 0.99 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.49 | (0.14) | 1.08 | (0.12) | 2.41 | (0.15) | 1.02 | (0.07) |
| Poland | 4.31 | (0.08) | 2.85 | (0.19) | 4.37 | (0.16) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 0.98 | (0.06) |
| Portugal | 3.26 | (0.08) | 2.19 | (0.18) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.64 | (0.18) | 4.20 | (0.07) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
| Slovak Republic | 3.69 | (0.09) | 2.02 | (0.17) | 3.33 | (0.13) | 4.41 | (0.13) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.25 | (0.06) |
| Slovenia | 3.78 | (0.01) | 2.70 | (0.01) | 3.42 | (0.02) | 4.00 | (0.02) | 5.00 | (0.03) | 0.91 | (0.01) |
| Spain | 1.36 | (0.06) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.55 | (0.10) | 2.75 | (0.11) | 1.06 | (0.04) |
| Sweden | 1.62 | (0.09) | 0.56 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.81 | (0.17) | 3.10 | (0.18) | 1.08 | (0.05) |
| Switzerland | 1.38 | (0.06) | 0.23 | (0.11) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.70 | (0.13) | 2.59 | (0.09) | 0.97 | (0.04) |
| Turkey | 1.76 | (0.12) | 0.27 | (0.14) | 1.05 | (0.13) | 2.13 | (0.20) | 3.61 | (0.13) | 1.32 | (0.06) |
| United Kingdom | 3.96 | (0.07) | 2.57 | (0.09) | 3.65 | (0.13) | 4.63 | (0.14) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.05 | (0.04) |
| United States | 2.71 | (0.12) | 0.78 | (0.21) | 2.26 | (0.16) | 3.18 | (0.15) | 4.62 | (0.12) | 1.48 | (0.07) |
| OECD average | 2.36 | (0.01) | 0.94 | (0.02) | 1.94 | (0.02) | 2.73 | (0.02) | 3.82 | (0.02) | 1.17 | (0.01) |
| Albania | 3.30 | (0.09) | 1.37 | (0.12) | 2.89 | (0.21) | 4.00 | (0.09) | 4.94 | (0.10) | 1.37 | (0.05) |
| $\stackrel{\text { Argentina }}{ }$ | 2.13 | (0.10) | 0.58 | (0.11) | 1.44 | (0.14) | 2.56 | (0.15) | 3.94 | (0.15) | 1.38 | (0.06) |
| © Brazil | 2.10 | (0.07) | 0.92 | (0.03) | 1.36 | (0.12) | 2.60 | (0.13) | 3.51 | (0.09) | 1.13 | (0.04) |
| Bulgaria | 2.62 | (0.11) | 0.69 | (0.13) | 2.08 | (0.17) | 3.26 | (0.16) | 4.45 | (0.09) | 1.46 | (0.05) |
| Colombia | 1.65 | (0.10) | 0.00 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.10) | 1.92 | (0.20) | 3.69 | (0.20) | 1.43 | (0.08) |
| Costa Rica | 1.86 | (0.10) | 0.33 | (0.12) | 1.12 | (0.13) | 2.33 | (0.15) | 3.65 | (0.15) | 1.36 | (0.07) |
| Croatia | 2.78 | (0.09) | 1.00 | (0.14) | 2.59 | (0.13) | 3.15 | (0.13) | 4.38 | (0.10) | 1.32 | (0.06) |
| Cyprus* | 2.98 | (0.00) | 1.76 | (0.00) | 2.77 | (0.00) | 3.13 | (0.00) | 4.28 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 4.44 | (0.07) | 3.34 | (0.15) | 4.43 | (0.17) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 0.79 | (0.05) |
| Indonesia | 2.62 | (0.13) | 0.75 | (0.16) | 2.11 | (0.19) | 3.19 | (0.18) | 4.44 | (0.11) | 1.42 | (0.06) |
| Jordan | 2.07 | (0.09) | 0.43 | (0.11) | 1.67 | (0.15) | 2.34 | (0.12) | 3.85 | (0.12) | 1.35 | (0.06) |
| Kazakhstan | 3.77 | (0.08) | 2.28 | (0.14) | 3.67 | (0.12) | 4.15 | (0.15) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.08 | (0.06) |
| Latvia | 2.78 | (0.09) | 1.03 | (0.13) | 2.38 | (0.13) | 3.27 | (0.14) | 4.46 | (0.10) | 1.34 | (0.05) |
| Liechtenstein | 1.36 | (0.02) | 0.71 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 2.75 | (0.08) | 0.95 | (0.01) |
| Lithuania | 2.86 | (0.10) | 1.21 | (0.14) | 2.73 | (0.14) | 3.19 | (0.14) | 4.31 | (0.07) | 1.21 | (0.05) |
| Macao-China | 3.87 | (0.00) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 3.62 | (0.00) | 4.88 | (0.00) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.31 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 4.25 | (0.07) | 2.93 | (0.14) | 4.08 | (0.15) | 5.00 | (0.04) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.04) |
| Montenegro | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.58 | (0.00) | 2.26 | (0.01) | 3.44 | (0.01) | 4.73 | (0.01) | 1.29 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 2.07 | (0.09) | 0.70 | (0.07) | 1.28 | (0.13) | 2.29 | (0.12) | 4.02 | (0.16) | 1.37 | (0.06) |
| Qatar | 3.72 | (0.00) | 2.11 | (0.00) | 3.32 | (0.00) | 4.45 | (0.00) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.27 | (0.00) |
| Romania | 2.92 | (0.09) | 1.63 | (0.10) | 2.50 | (0.15) | 3.18 | (0.15) | 4.39 | (0.09) | 1.11 | (0.05) |
| Russian Federation | 3.87 | (0.07) | 2.45 | (0.12) | 3.62 | (0.12) | 4.41 | (0.12) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.08 | (0.06) |
| Serbia | 2.78 | (0.09) | 1.35 | (0.11) | 2.42 | (0.16) | 3.03 | (0.10) | 4.31 | (0.12) | 1.16 | (0.05) |
| Shanghai-China | 2.81 | (0.09) | 0.85 | (0.14) | 2.30 | (0.14) | 3.31 | (0.13) | 4.77 | (0.11) | 1.50 | (0.06) |
| Singapore | 3.66 | (0.01) | 2.46 | (0.03) | 3.61 | (0.02) | 4.00 | (0.00) | 4.58 | (0.01) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
| Chinese Taipei | 3.19 | (0.11) | 1.45 | (0.15) | 2.87 | (0.14) | 3.77 | (0.16) | 4.66 | (0.13) | 1.28 | (0.08) |
| Thailand | 3.89 | (0.08) | 1.90 | (0.19) | 3.84 | (0.10) | 4.84 | (0.14) | 5.00 | (0.00) | 1.35 | (0.08) |
| Tunisia | 2.73 | (0.13) | 0.60 | (0.11) | 2.20 | (0.27) | 3.44 | (0.15) | 4.69 | (0.12) | 1.60 | (0.05) |
| United Arab Emirates | 3.15 | (0.07) | 1.40 | (0.09) | 2.71 | (0.09) | 3.55 | (0.11) | 4.93 | (0.09) | 1.38 | (0.04) |
| Uruguay | 1.76 | (0.08) | 0.45 | (0.10) | 1.29 | (0.14) | 2.00 | (0.05) | 3.29 | (0.16) | 1.13 | (0.05) |
| Viet Nam | 2.99 | (0.08) | 1.62 | (0.08) | 2.87 | (0.13) | 3.07 | (0.11) | 4.40 | (0.12) | 1.08 | (0.05) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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| $\cdots$ | Albania | 402 | (4.4) | 390 | (5.8) | 391 | (4.9) | 394 | (4.6) | -2.2 | (1.56) | 0.9 | (0.07) | 0.1 | (0.16) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | Argentina | 395 | (8.4) | 391 | (6.1) | 380 | (5.8) | 389 | (5.8) | -2.1 | (2.68) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.2 | (0.41) |
| ส | Brazil | 385 | (3.6) | 384 | (3.3) | 399 | (5.4) | 409 | (4.9) | 9.2 | (2.19) | 1.1 | (0.08) | 1.8 | (0.83) |
|  | Bulgaria | 411 | (8.9) | 432 | (9.4) | 447 | (8.8) | 473 | (8.0) | 17.0 | (2.82) | 1.7 | (0.26) | 7.1 | (2.42) |
|  | Colombia | 356 | (6.3) | 373 | (6.6) | 383 | (5.5) | 398 | (4.2) | 10.5 | (2.00) | 1.7 | (0.22) | 4.1 | (1.53) |
|  | Costa Rica | 407 | (6.1) | 401 | (5.8) | 401 | (5.2) | 419 | (8.4) | 4.0 | (3.71) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.6 | (1.18) |
|  | Croatia | 434 | (6.0) | 471 | (6.8) | 485 | (7.5) | 495 | (7.8) | 19.6 | (2.70) | 2.0 | (0.22) | 8.5 | (2.27) |
|  | Cyprus* | 424 | (2.4) | 440 | (3.5) | 443 | (3.2) | 449 | (2.2) | 10.9 | (1.10) | 1.3 | (0.09) | 1.4 | (0.27) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 557 | (8.2) | 560 | (6.0) | 564 | (6.8) | 564 | (6.5) | 3.0 | (6.51) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.39) |
|  | Indonesia | 356 | (6.8) | 368 | (5.1) | 374 | (8.1) | 402 | (10.4) | 12.8 | (3.22) | 1.5 | (0.23) | 6.5 | (2.98) |
|  | Jordan | 373 | (4.9) | 379 | (5.6) | 387 | (5.5) | 403 | (7.8) | 8.6 | (2.67) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 2.2 | (1.29) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 439 | (5.7) | 437 | (6.6) | 433 | (5.8) | 418 | (4.6) | -6.5 | (2.70) | 0.9 | (0.10) | 1.0 | (0.81) |
|  | Latvia | 481 | (6.0) | 489 | (5.4) | 490 | (5.1) | 501 | (5.2) | 5.9 | (2.10) | 1.3 | (0.15) | 0.9 | (0.65) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 545 | (15.3) | 555 | (20.1) | 544 | (18.8) | 495 | (11.7) | -26.7 | (3.91) | 0.5 | (0.27) | 7.0 | (1.99) |
|  | Lithuania | 464 | (6.8) | 476 | (6.5) | 486 | (5.6) | 491 | (6.2) | 9.4 | (2.85) | 1.3 | (0.13) | 1.6 | (0.99) |
|  | Macao-China | 525 | (2.4) | 534 | (3.8) | 545 | (3.5) | 548 | (2.5) | 6.5 | (0.68) | 1.3 | (0.06) | 0.8 | (0.17) |
|  | Malaysia | 428 | (7.2) | 420 | (7.8) | 417 | (5.6) | 417 | (6.0) | -4.8 | (4.11) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.3 | (0.58) |
|  | Montenegro | 415 | (2.6) | 407 | (3.0) | 391 | (2.9) | 426 | (2.2) | 2.9 | (0.78) | 0.8 | (0.07) | 0.2 | (0.11) |
|  | Peru | 359 | (7.1) | 359 | (4.9) | 367 | (6.9) | 386 | (8.1) | 8.3 | (3.34) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 1.8 | (1.55) |
|  | Qatar | 375 | (2.1) | 389 | (2.2) | 369 | (3.2) | 373 | (1.6) | 0.0 | (0.53) | 1.0 | (0.04) | 0.0 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | 430 | (7.7) | 440 | (6.8) | 450 | (7.0) | 459 | (6.8) | 10.9 | (3.97) | 1.3 | (0.18) | 2.2 | (1.72) |
|  | Russian Federation | 475 | (6.1) | 477 | (5.9) | 484 | (5.7) | 492 | (6.4) | 6.8 | (3.72) | 1.2 | (0.11) | 0.7 | (0.79) |
|  | Serbia | 430 | (8.5) | 445 | (6.3) | 449 | (8.3) | 468 | (11.0) | 11.4 | (4.67) | 1.4 | (0.21) | 2.2 | (1.85) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 547 | (7.9) | 610 | (8.4) | 635 | (8.0) | 659 | (7.2) | 27.6 | (2.40) | 2.8 | (0.30) | 16.9 | (2.90) |
|  | Singapore | 559 | (3.3) | 564 | (3.9) | 572 | (3.6) | 603 | (2.8) | 19.2 | (1.49) | 1.2 | (0.07) | 2.8 | (0.43) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 537 | (9.1) | 540 | (9.5) | 569 | (10.8) | 593 | (11.1) | 18.6 | (4.09) | 1.4 | (0.17) | 4.3 | (1.96) |
|  | Thailand | 393 | (4.5) | 415 | (6.5) | 446 | (7.0) | 453 | (5.9) | 17.7 | (2.18) | 1.8 | (0.21) | 8.5 | (1.81) |
|  | Tunisia | 379 | (7.3) | 394 | (10.1) | 390 | (7.0) | 388 | (8.6) | 1.6 | (2.92) | 1.2 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.49) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 422 | (4.6) | 441 | (4.3) | 436 | (5.7) | 453 | (6.3) | 7.1 | (2.17) | 1.4 | (0.12) | 1.2 | (0.69) |
|  | Uruguay | 398 | (7.4) | 407 | (5.6) | 406 | (6.9) | 426 | (10.7) | 11.1 | (4.80) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 2.0 | (1.71) |
|  | Viet Nam | 487 | (8.3) | 506 | (8.5) | 512 | (9.5) | 540 | (8.1) | 15.9 | (3.89) | 1.5 | (0.25) | 4.0 | (1.95) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV．3．33 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre－primary education（ISCED 0） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No attendance |  | For one year or less |  | For more than one year |  |
|  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| O Australia | 4.6 | （0．2） | 43.7 | （0．6） | 51.7 | （0．6） |
| $\bigcirc$ Austria | 1.8 | （0．3） | 10.5 | （0．6） | 87.7 | （0．7） |
| Belgium | 2.4 | （0．2） | 4.6 | （0．3） | 93.0 | （0．4） |
| Canada | 9.1 | （0．3） | 40.4 | （0．7） | 50.5 | （0．6） |
| Chile | 9.2 | （0．7） | 56.5 | （0．9） | 34.3 | （0．8） |
| Czech Republic | 3.2 | （0．5） | 8.8 | （0．6） | 88.0 | （0．8） |
| Denmark | 1.1 | （0．1） | 20.1 | （0．6） | 78.9 | （0．6） |
| Estonia | 7.3 | （0．6） | 8.7 | （0．5） | 83.9 | （0．8） |
| Finland | 2.5 | （0．2） | 34.8 | （1．0） | 62.7 | （1．0） |
| France | 1.8 | （0．3） | 6.4 | （0．3） | 91.8 | （0．4） |
| Germany | 3.3 | （0．3） | 11.5 | （0．6） | 85.2 | （0．7） |
| Greece | 4.6 | （0．5） | 27.4 | （0．9） | 68.0 | （1．0） |
| Hungary | 0.5 | （0．1） | 4.0 | （0．4） | 95.5 | （0．4） |
| Iceland | 2.1 | （0．2） | 3.2 | （0．3） | 94.7 | （0．4） |
| Ireland | 13.6 | （0．7） | 43.6 | （0．9） | 42.8 | （0．9） |
| Israel | 2.1 | （0．2） | 16.5 | （0．8） | 81.4 | （0．9） |
| Italy | 4.3 | （0．2） | 8.0 | （0．2） | 87.7 | （0．3） |
| Japan | 0.9 | （0．1） | 2.2 | （0．2） | 96.9 | （0．2） |
| Korea | 4.5 | （0．4） | 12.6 | （0．7） | 82.9 | （0．9） |
| Luxembourg | 4.6 | （0．3） | 12.8 | （0．4） | 82.6 | （0．5） |
| Mexico | 9.5 | （0．3） | 18.7 | （0．3） | 71.8 | （0．5） |
| Netherlands | 2.3 | （0．3） | 2.7 | （0．3） | 95.0 | （0．3） |
| New Zealand | 9.3 | （0．6） | 19.5 | （0．7） | 71.2 | （0．8） |
| Norway | 7.9 | （0．4） | 5.8 | （0．4） | 86.3 | （0．6） |
| Poland | 2.5 | （0．3） | 46.4 | （1．5） | 51.1 | （1．5） |
| Portugal | 15.0 | （0．8） | 20.7 | （0．8） | 64.4 | （1．1） |
| Slovak Republic | 6.8 | （0．7） | 13.2 | （0．8） | 80.0 | （1．0） |
| Slovenia | 14.7 | （0．5） | 12.8 | （0．6） | 72.5 | （0．7） |
| Spain | 5.9 | （0．3） | 8.3 | （0．2） | 85.8 | （0．4） |
| Sweden | 8.2 | （0．5） | 20.4 | （0．8） | 71.4 | （0．8） |
| Switzerland | 1.8 | （0．2） | 25.0 | （1．8） | 73.1 | （1．8） |
| Turkey | 70.3 | （1．4） | 21.0 | （1．0） | 8.6 | （0．8） |
| United Kingdom | 5.0 | （0．4） | 26.1 | （0．5） | 68.9 | （0．7） |
| United States | 1.5 | （0．2） | 24.0 | （0．9） | 74.6 | （0．9） |
| OECD average | 7.2 | （0．1） | 18.8 | （0．1） | 74.0 | （0．1） |
| Albania | 25.4 | （0．9） | 21.8 | （0．8） | 52.8 | （1．1） |
| Argentina | 6.2 | （0．9） | 22.6 | （0．9） | 71.2 | （1．4） |
| ® Brazil | 18.9 | （0．6） | 33.4 | （0．7） | 47.7 | （0．8） |
| Bulgaria | 10.2 | （0．7） | 13.0 | （0．5） | 76.7 | （1．0） |
| Colombia | 14.2 | （0．8） | 52.5 | （0．8） | 33.3 | （1．1） |
| Costa Rica | 15.4 | （0．9） | 39.6 | （1．1） | 45.0 | （1．2） |
| Croatia | 26.8 | （1．1） | 22.4 | （0．8） | 50.8 | （1．1） |
| Cyprus＊ | 3.6 | （0．3） | 23.5 | （0．6） | 73.0 | （0．7） |
| Hong Kong－China | 1.6 | （0．2） | 3.3 | （0．3） | 95.1 | （0．4） |
| Indonesia | 46.2 | （2．2） | 31.4 | （2．0） | 22.5 | （1．5） |
| Jordan | 24.2 | （1．0） | 49.3 | （0．9） | 26.5 | （1．0） |
| Kazakhstan | 65.0 | （1．7） | 11.3 | （0．6） | 23.8 | （1．4） |
| Latvia | 11.3 | （0．8） | 13.3 | （0．7） | 75.4 | （0．9） |
| Liechtenstein | 0.7 | （0．5） | 8.8 | （1．8） | 90.5 | （1．9） |
| Lithuania | 30.5 | （1．0） | 13.2 | （0．6） | 56.3 | （1．0） |
| Macao－China | 2.4 | （0．2） | 11.9 | （0．4） | 85.6 | （0．5） |
| Malaysia | 23.8 | （1．3） | 28.6 | （1．0） | 47.6 | （1．4） |
| Montenegro | 32.8 | （0．6） | 24.8 | （0．6） | 42.4 | （0．7） |
| Peru | 13.8 | （0．7） | 25.0 | （0．7） | 61.1 | （1．1） |
| Qatar | 30.7 | （0．5） | 41.5 | （0．5） | 27.8 | （0．4） |
| Romania | 4.5 | （0．5） | 9.0 | （0．5） | 86.5 | （0．8） |
| Russian Federation | 18.9 | （1．1） | 10.2 | （0．6） | 71.0 | （1．4） |
| Serbia | 20.3 | （0．9） | 28.9 | （1．1） | 50.7 | （1．2） |
| Shanghai－China | 3.6 | （0．6） | 8.6 | （0．6） | 87.8 | （1．0） |
| Singapore | 2.3 | （0．2） | 7.1 | （0．4） | 90.6 | （0．4） |
| Chinese Taipei | 1.5 | （0．2） | 14.7 | （0．6） | 83.8 | （0．6） |
| Thailand | 1.7 | （0．3） | 10.5 | （0．6） | 87.8 | （0．6） |
| Tunisia | 37.6 | （1．6） | 39.3 | （1．1） | 23.1 | （1．0） |
| United Arab Emirates | 23.7 | （0．7） | 26.6 | （0．6） | 49.7 | （0．9） |
| Uruguay | 16.2 | （0．8） | 14.1 | （0．7） | 69.7 | （1．0） |
| Viet Nam | 9.3 | （1．0） | 22.5 | （1．2） | 68.2 | （1．5） |

＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.3.34 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarter of ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 42.7 | (1.2) | 49.0 | (1.1) | 54.2 | (1.1) | 61.5 | (1.3) | 42.3 | (1.1) | 49.9 | (0.8) | 64.3 | (1.3) |
| L | Austria | 80.7 | (1.9) | 86.4 | (1.3) | 90.7 | (1.1) | 93.2 | (0.9) | 82.1 | (1.6) | 88.7 | (0.9) | 93.2 | (1.0) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 89.2 | (0.9) | 92.1 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.5) | 96.1 | (0.5) | 87.3 | (0.9) | 94.6 | (0.6) | 96.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Canada | 42.6 | (1.1) | 46.8 | (1.2) | 52.0 | (1.2) | 61.2 | (1.1) | 46.6 | (2.3) | 48.1 | (1.2) | 58.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Chile | 27.9 | (1.3) | 30.9 | (1.6) | 31.1 | (1.6) | 47.6 | (1.5) | 29.9 | (1.3) | 31.2 | (1.3) | 42.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 84.4 | (1.9) | 87.4 | (1.3) | 91.0 | (1.2) | 89.5 | (1.1) | 84.0 | (2.3) | 88.8 | (0.9) | 89.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Denmark | 72.6 | (1.1) | 78.2 | (1.4) | 80.0 | (1.2) | 85.2 | (1.1) | 73.1 | (1.5) | 78.3 | (0.9) | 85.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Estonia | 76.7 | (1.7) | 84.0 | (1.2) | 86.4 | (1.3) | 88.9 | (1.0) | 75.9 | (2.4) | 84.5 | (0.8) | 89.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Finland | 51.4 | (1.4) | 61.3 | (1.7) | 66.3 | (1.6) | 72.0 | (1.6) | 47.6 | (3.1) | 62.4 | (1.3) | 78.2 | (1.8) |
|  | France | 87.5 | (1.1) | 90.6 | (0.8) | 94.5 | (0.7) | 95.2 | (0.7) | 83.9 | (1.3) | 93.2 | (0.7) | 96.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Germany | 79.2 | (1.6) | 84.3 | (1.2) | 88.2 | (1.1) | 91.2 | (1.1) | 75.8 | (1.7) | 86.7 | (0.9) | 92.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 59.9 | (1.9) | 67.1 | (1.8) | 70.3 | (1.5) | 74.8 | (1.6) | 61.8 | (2.6) | 68.3 | (1.5) | 73.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Hungary | 94.8 | (0.8) | 95.8 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.7) | 96.3 | (0.8) | 94.2 | (0.7) | 95.4 | (0.6) | 96.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 90.2 | (1.0) | 95.4 | (0.7) | 96.7 | (0.7) | 96.6 | (0.7) | 93.3 | (1.0) | 94.1 | (0.5) | 96.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Ireland | 34.2 | (1.6) | 40.2 | (1.8) | 44.4 | (1.7) | 52.4 | (1.6) | 41.2 | (2.1) | 38.5 | (1.1) | 53.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Israel | 73.0 | (1.7) | 80.9 | (1.4) | 86.4 | (1.3) | 85.7 | (1.3) | 71.7 | (1.9) | 81.8 | (1.6) | 89.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Italy | 84.2 | (0.7) | 87.5 | (0.6) | 89.4 | (0.5) | 89.9 | (0.6) | 84.0 | (0.8) | 87.8 | (0.5) | 91.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 95.8 | (0.5) | 97.2 | (0.5) | 97.1 | (0.4) | 97.7 | (0.4) | 94.9 | (0.6) | 97.5 | (0.3) | 98.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 79.8 | (1.5) | 80.7 | (1.4) | 85.2 | (1.1) | 85.7 | (1.3) | 82.1 | (1.8) | 82.4 | (1.3) | 84.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 74.8 | (1.2) | 83.3 | (1.1) | 87.2 | (0.9) | 85.1 | (1.0) | 78.4 | (0.8) | 87.9 | (1.1) | 85.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | 61.3 | (1.2) | 68.6 | (0.9) | 74.2 | (0.7) | 83.3 | (0.6) | 64.4 | (1.2) | 71.3 | (0.7) | 80.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 92.7 | (1.0) | 96.2 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.8) | 95.9 | (0.6) | 93.3 | (1.0) | 95.5 | (0.4) | 95.6 | (0.7) |
|  | New Zealand | 60.3 | (1.9) | 70.8 | (1.7) | 74.6 | (1.5) | 80.6 | (1.4) | 61.9 | (2.7) | 71.6 | (1.3) | 78.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Norway | 78.0 | (1.3) | 84.9 | (1.3) | 88.1 | (1.2) | 94.6 | (0.8) | 79.0 | (1.9) | 85.5 | (0.7) | 93.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Poland | 28.4 | (2.2) | 42.8 | (2.5) | 56.7 | (2.4) | 76.6 | (1.7) | 31.9 | (3.2) | 50.7 | (2.2) | 75.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Portugal | 52.5 | (1.7) | 60.3 | (1.7) | 65.8 | (2.0) | 78.9 | (1.4) | 59.5 | (1.8) | 62.6 | (1.6) | 75.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 63.9 | (2.4) | 81.0 | (1.6) | 85.5 | (1.3) | 89.8 | (1.0) | 63.6 | (2.6) | 84.2 | (1.0) | 89.4 | (1.5) |
|  | Slovenia | 61.4 | (1.6) | 69.3 | (1.3) | 77.1 | (1.3) | 82.6 | (1.4) | 63.5 | (1.4) | 73.2 | (1.1) | 80.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Spain | 80.1 | (0.9) | 84.1 | (0.9) | 87.9 | (0.9) | 91.3 | (0.5) | 82.7 | (1.1) | 85.6 | (0.6) | 89.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Sweden | 61.9 | (1.5) | 70.7 | (1.5) | 76.2 | (1.5) | 77.3 | (1.2) | 70.5 | (2.4) | 68.3 | (1.1) | 80.5 | (1.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 68.2 | (2.4) | 71.7 | (2.0) | 77.0 | (2.2) | 75.6 | (2.6) | 63.2 | (4.3) | 76.1 | (1.9) | 77.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Turkey | 1.7 | (0.5) | 3.4 | (0.7) | 6.7 | (1.2) | 22.9 | (1.9) | 4.8 | (0.7) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 19.2 | (1.9) |
|  | United Kingdom | 61.1 | (1.6) | 67.4 | (1.3) | 71.9 | (1.3) | 76.9 | (1.1) | 60.3 | (1.5) | 70.3 | (1.0) | 74.3 | (1.3) |
|  | United States | 61.1 | (2.0) | 72.2 | (1.6) | 79.7 | (1.5) | 85.3 | (1.1) | 63.9 | (1.6) | 75.6 | (1.2) | 82.8 | (1.3) |
|  | OECD average | 66.3 | (0.3) | 72.4 | (0.2) | 76.4 | (0.2) | 81.1 | (0.2) | 67.4 | (0.3) | 74.0 | (0.2) | 80.8 | (0.2) |


| $\sim$ Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 56.3 | (2.5) | 68.9 | (2.2) | 76.4 | (1.8) | 83.8 | (1.6) | 54.1 | (2.1) | 73.6 | (2.3) | 85.9 | (1.4) |
| む Brazil | 36.8 | (1.1) | 44.7 | (1.0) | 49.2 | (1.5) | 60.5 | (1.6) | 38.8 | (1.3) | 46.8 | (1.1) | 61.4 | (1.9) |
| Bulgaria | 66.2 | (2.3) | 79.6 | (1.5) | 81.4 | (1.2) | 80.4 | (1.1) | 69.0 | (2.1) | 80.0 | (1.4) | 81.7 | (0.9) |
| Colombia | 23.9 | (1.6) | 28.6 | (1.6) | 33.6 | (1.6) | 47.3 | (2.5) | 27.0 | (1.8) | 29.6 | (1.4) | 44.8 | (1.9) |
| Costa Rica | 33.1 | (2.1) | 37.9 | (2.0) | 46.7 | (2.0) | 62.5 | (2.3) | 35.5 | (2.3) | 42.1 | (1.3) | 62.8 | (3.0) |
| Croatia | 27.4 | (1.8) | 44.4 | (1.8) | 58.1 | (1.9) | 73.5 | (1.6) | 32.3 | (1.9) | 53.8 | (2.1) | 71.2 | (1.7) |
| Cyprus* | 66.9 | (1.5) | 72.0 | (1.3) | 76.0 | (1.2) | 77.4 | (1.2) | 68.3 | (1.2) | 75.1 | (1.0) | 75.9 | (1.0) |
| Hong Kong-China | 91.2 | (0.9) | 95.6 | (0.8) | 96.4 | (0.7) | 97.2 | (0.6) | 92.2 | (0.9) | 95.7 | (0.5) | 98.2 | (0.4) |
| Indonesia | 13.7 | (1.7) | 15.5 | (2.0) | 24.3 | (2.0) | 36.6 | (3.5) | 16.7 | (2.3) | 20.0 | (2.6) | 33.8 | (4.0) |
| Jordan | 15.5 | (1.4) | 22.2 | (1.7) | 30.0 | (1.7) | 38.3 | (1.6) | 18.4 | (1.8) | 24.1 | (1.2) | 41.5 | (2.7) |
| Kazakhstan | 9.6 | (1.2) | 19.9 | (2.5) | 26.2 | (1.8) | 39.4 | (2.1) | 9.2 | (1.8) | 18.2 | (1.6) | 42.2 | (2.2) |
| Latvia | 60.6 | (2.4) | 75.7 | (1.8) | 81.2 | (1.8) | 83.3 | (1.3) | 58.5 | (3.5) | 77.2 | (1.4) | 83.3 | (1.1) |
| Liechtenstein | 91.0 | (3.6) | 93.2 | (2.7) | 94.6 | (2.9) | 83.8 | (4.8) | C | c | 88.9 | (2.8) | C | C |
| Lithuania | 38.6 | (1.7) | 47.9 | (1.7) | 66.3 | (1.6) | 72.4 | (1.4) | 32.6 | (2.4) | 57.4 | (1.8) | 76.3 | (1.6) |
| Macao-China | 83.7 | (1.0) | 86.1 | (0.9) | 86.6 | (0.8) | 86.4 | (1.0) | 84.9 | (0.7) | 85.6 | (1.0) | 86.8 | (0.8) |
| Malaysia | 33.4 | (2.0) | 43.1 | (2.1) | 51.7 | (2.3) | 62.2 | (2.1) | 34.9 | (1.9) | 44.2 | (2.1) | 65.0 | (2.3) |
| Montenegro | 22.6 | (1.2) | 36.7 | (1.5) | 48.1 | (1.8) | 61.9 | (1.5) | 30.4 | (1.1) | 37.5 | (1.6) | 57.5 | (1.3) |
| Peru | 45.7 | (1.8) | 56.8 | (1.7) | 66.4 | (2.2) | 75.7 | (1.8) | 48.4 | (1.8) | 58.8 | (1.7) | 76.2 | (1.7) |
| Qatar | 15.8 | (0.7) | 28.9 | (0.8) | 31.6 | (1.0) | 35.4 | (1.0) | 21.8 | (0.6) | 23.2 | (1.0) | 34.7 | (0.6) |
| Romania | 79.3 | (1.8) | 86.7 | (1.2) | 87.9 | (1.3) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 80.8 | (1.8) | 86.3 | (1.1) | 92.8 | (0.8) |
| Russian Federation | 55.9 | (2.6) | 70.4 | (2.2) | 77.1 | (1.4) | 80.9 | (1.5) | 54.5 | (3.9) | 72.0 | (2.5) | 82.0 | (1.2) |
| Serbia | 35.9 | (1.9) | 44.1 | (1.6) | 54.9 | (2.2) | 68.2 | (1.7) | 41.2 | (2.3) | 48.3 | (1.9) | 67.5 | (1.8) |
| Shanghai-China | 73.9 | (2.8) | 89.7 | (1.2) | 92.2 | (0.8) | 95.4 | (0.7) | 76.0 | (2.5) | 90.8 | (0.9) | 94.8 | (0.7) |
| Singapore | 88.5 | (0.9) | 90.6 | (0.8) | 91.5 | (0.9) | 91.9 | (0.8) | 88.4 | (0.8) | 90.8 | (0.6) | 92.8 | (0.9) |
| Chinese Taipei | 78.2 | (1.4) | 83.5 | (1.0) | 86.2 | (0.9) | 87.3 | (1.1) | 81.9 | (1.2) | 83.6 | (1.0) | 86.0 | (1.2) |
| Thailand | 83.9 | (1.2) | 86.3 | (1.2) | 87.9 | (1.1) | 93.2 | (0.7) | 84.3 | (1.3) | 87.3 | (0.9) | 93.0 | (0.7) |
| Tunisia | 10.9 | (1.1) | 21.4 | (2.2) | 28.2 | (1.5) | 32.3 | (1.9) | 12.8 | (1.3) | 23.8 | (1.5) | 33.2 | (1.7) |
| United Arab Emirates | 38.2 | (1.6) | 48.6 | (1.6) | 54.6 | (1.3) | 57.8 | (1.3) | 40.2 | (1.4) | 48.5 | (1.8) | 58.2 | (1.9) |
| Uruguay | 57.7 | (1.8) | 65.0 | (2.0) | 70.8 | (1.7) | 85.2 | (1.2) | 60.5 | (1.6) | 68.6 | (1.7) | 87.5 | (1.3) |
| Viet Nam | 49.8 | (2.7) | 66.5 | (2.0) | 73.7 | (2.5) | 82.7 | (1.7) | 59.4 | (2.7) | 67.3 | (2.7) | 82.4 | (1.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
StatLink (\#)ाड्रL http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 2/2]
Pre-school attendance, by school features
Table IV.3.34 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than $\mathbf{3 0 0 0}$ people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town ( $\mathbf{3} 000$ to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 48.6 | (0.8) | 56.7 | (1.1) | 54.0 | (0.7) | 42.0 | (1.3) | 46.4 | (2.2) | 49.5 | (1.3) | 53.3 | (0.9) |
| U | Austria | 87.3 | (0.8) | 92.1 | (2.2) | 79.3 | (4.9) | 88.2 | (0.7) | 85.1 | (3.0) | 88.1 | (1.0) | 87.9 | (1.1) |
| - | Belgium | 90.0 | (1.0) | 94.3 | (0.4) | 74.5 | (1.9) | 95.0 | (0.3) | 88.3 | (5.2) | 93.7 | (0.4) | 91.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Canada | 50.4 | (0.7) | 52.1 | (2.7) | 37.3 | (1.3) | 52.7 | (0.7) | 47.3 | (2.4) | 43.6 | (1.4) | 55.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Chile | 30.8 | (1.0) | 36.1 | (1.1) | 30.1 | (2.8) | 34.5 | (0.8) | 30.8 | (2.9) | 31.5 | (1.4) | 36.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 87.8 | (1.0) | 85.9 | (2.5) | 87.5 | (1.3) | 88.6 | (0.8) | 88.1 | (4.6) | 87.8 | (1.1) | 87.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Denmark | 77.8 | (0.7) | 82.4 | (1.3) | 78.8 | (0.6) | 89.6 | (5.1) | 77.7 | (1.4) | 79.5 | (0.9) | 78.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Estonia | 83.8 | (0.8) | 86.1 | (4.9) | 84.0 | (0.8) | 81.5 | (5.0) | 74.6 | (2.3) | 86.7 | (0.9) | 87.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Finland | 62.0 | (1.1) | 81.1 | (3.9) | 62.7 | (1.0) | c | c | 49.1 | (6.5) | 58.0 | (1.2) | 77.3 | (1.2) |
|  | France | 91.7 | (0.6) | 91.2 | (0.9) | 83.1 | (1.3) | 95.4 | (0.4) | 87.8 | (2.0) | 92.3 | (0.7) | 91.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Germany | 84.8 | (0.8) | 89.2 | (3.5) | 85.2 | (0.6) | 84.2 | (5.8) | c | C | 85.2 | (0.9) | 85.0 | (1.6) |
|  | Greece | 68.3 | (1.0) | C | C | 42.4 | (3.9) | 69.5 | (1.0) | 69.6 | (4.3) | 67.8 | (1.3) | 67.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Hungary | 95.6 | (0.4) | 95.7 | (1.1) | 90.2 | (1.6) | 96.2 | (0.3) | 95.4 | (2.3) | 96.2 | (0.5) | 94.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 94.7 | (0.4) | C | c | 94.7 | (0.4) | c | c | 92.4 | (0.9) | 96.5 | (0.5) | 93.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Ireland | 40.8 | (1.3) | 43.1 | (1.3) | 48.0 | (1.1) | 34.2 | (1.3) | 38.4 | (2.0) | 40.5 | (1.2) | 50.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Israel | 81.3 | (0.9) | c | c | 83.5 | (2.3) | 81.0 | (0.9) | 87.2 | (2.1) | 76.8 | (1.5) | 84.3 | (1.5) |
|  | Italy | 87.8 | (0.3) | 86.1 | (1.6) | 56.7 | (3.9) | 88.4 | (0.3) | 85.0 | (2.6) | 89.0 | (0.4) | 85.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Japan | 96.7 | (0.3) | 97.4 | (0.3) | c | c | 96.9 | (0.2) | C | c | 96.4 | (0.5) | 97.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 82.5 | (1.2) | 83.2 | (1.4) | 78.2 | (5.2) | 83.2 | (0.9) | c | c | 81.2 | (3.9) | 83.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 83.2 | (0.6) | 79.1 | (1.5) | 80.2 | (0.7) | 86.1 | (0.7) | C | C | 82.6 | (0.5) | C | c |
|  | Mexico | 70.4 | (0.6) | 82.2 | (0.9) | 67.6 | (0.9) | 74.3 | (0.7) | 66.0 | (1.4) | 70.6 | (1.1) | 75.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 94.8 | (0.7) | 94.7 | (0.4) | 94.7 | (0.4) | 95.8 | (0.7) | c | c | 95.1 | (0.4) | 93.9 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 71.3 | (0.9) | 79.4 | (2.3) | 57.4 | (3.4) | 72.1 | (0.8) | 67.0 | (3.5) | 73.8 | (1.6) | 70.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Norway | 86.4 | (0.6) | C | C | 86.3 | (0.6) | c | c | 83.1 | (1.6) | 87.0 | (0.8) | 86.7 | (1.6) |
|  | Poland | 50.4 | (1.6) | 76.5 | (3.5) | 51.0 | (1.5) | c | C | 32.4 | (3.0) | 54.4 | (2.1) | 72.9 | (2.5) |
|  | Portugal | 62.8 | (1.0) | 78.1 | (3.7) | 57.6 | (1.4) | 69.7 | (1.3) | 58.9 | (5.9) | 64.4 | (1.2) | 65.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 79.9 | (1.1) | 81.0 | (5.1) | 75.7 | (2.0) | 83.5 | (1.2) | 66.7 | (4.0) | 80.8 | (1.2) | 88.9 | (1.6) |
|  | Slovenia | 72.8 | (0.7) | 65.9 | (5.2) | 64.6 | (5.1) | 73.0 | (0.7) | 60.2 | (11.8) | 69.9 | (0.8) | 77.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Spain | 83.9 | (0.6) | 89.9 | (0.6) | 85.8 | (0.4) | C | C | 90.4 | (1.1) | 85.4 | (0.6) | 86.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Sweden | 70.8 | (0.9) | 75.2 | (2.4) | 71.9 | (0.9) | 49.2 | (5.7) | 71.5 | (1.6) | 70.9 | (1.3) | 72.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 71.8 | (2.0) | 86.3 | (2.4) | 74.3 | (2.0) | 69.4 | (4.1) | 69.7 | (7.4) | 70.9 | (2.4) | 81.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Turkey | 8.2 | (0.7) | C | c | 3.8 | (2.3) | 8.8 | (0.8) | 10.7 | (4.5) | 8.0 | (1.3) | 9.0 | (1.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 67.5 | (0.9) | 71.1 | (1.5) | c | c | 68.9 | (0.7) | 66.7 | (2.8) | 69.9 | (1.0) | 67.8 | (1.4) |
|  | United States | 74.2 | (1.0) | 84.1 | (2.9) | 69.2 | (2.5) | 75.3 | (0.9) | 72.6 | (3.5) | 76.6 | (1.3) | 73.3 | (1.3) |
|  | OECD average | 73.3 | (0.2) | 79.2 | (0.4) | 68.4 | (0.4) | 73.4 | (0.4) | 67.6 | (0.7) | 73.5 | (0.2) | 76.0 | (0.2) |



Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 司ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
[Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in student-teacher ratio
Table IV.3.35 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  | PISA 2012 |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Student-teacher ratio in the school |  | Student-teacher ratio in the school |  | Student-teacher ratio in the school |  |
|  |  | Mean ratio | S.E. | Mean ratio | S.E. | Dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 13.55 | (0.2) | 13.15 | (0.1) | -0.40 | (0.2) |
|  | Austria | 13.04 | (0.5) | 11.02 | (0.4) | -2.02 | (0.6) |
|  | Belgium | 9.40 | (0.2) | 9.27 | (0.1) | -0.13 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 17.00 | (0.1) | 15.60 | (0.2) | -1.40 | (0.3) |
|  | Czech Republic | 15.15 | (0.2) | 13.13 | (0.3) | -2.03 | (0.4) |
|  | Denmark | 11.28 | (0.2) | 12.09 | (0.2) | 0.81 | (0.3) |
|  | Finland | 10.75 | (0.2) | 10.61 | (0.1) | -0.15 | (0.2) |
|  | France | w | w | 11.80 | (0.2) | m | m |
|  | Germany | 17.62 | (0.3) | 15.13 | (0.3) | -2.49 | (0.5) |
|  | Greece | 9.69 | (0.2) | 9.11 | (0.3) | -0.58 | (0.4) |
|  | Hungary | 10.26 | (0.4) | 12.41 | (0.3) | 2.15 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 11.37 | (0.0) | 10.53 | (0.0) | -0.84 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 14.31 | (0.4) | 14.30 | (0.2) | -0.01 | (0.5) |
|  | Italy | 10.04 | (0.4) | 10.31 | (0.1) | 0.27 | (0.4) |
|  | Japan | 14.00 | (0.2) | 11.64 | (0.2) | -2.36 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 16.36 | (0.1) | 16.11 | (0.2) | -0.24 | (0.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 10.25 | (0.0) | 9.05 | (0.0) | -1.21 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | m | m | 30.59 | (0.7) | m | m |
|  | Netherlands | 15.37 | (0.3) | 16.76 | (0.4) | 1.39 | (0.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 16.46 | (0.2) | 15.16 | (0.2) | -1.30 | (0.3) |
|  | Norway | 10.32 | (0.1) | 10.44 | (0.1) | 0.12 | (0.2) |
|  | Poland | 13.30 | (0.2) | 9.43 | (0.2) | -3.87 | (0.3) |
|  | Portugal | 10.99 | (0.5) | 8.85 | (0.2) | -2.14 | (0.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 14.80 | (0.2) | 13.25 | (0.3) | -1.55 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 13.61 | (0.3) | 12.54 | (0.4) | -1.08 | (0.5) |
|  | Sweden | 12.40 | (0.3) | 12.46 | (0.2) | 0.06 | (0.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 12.64 | (0.4) | 12.07 | (0.3) | -0.57 | (0.5) |
|  | Turkey | 21.79 | (1.5) | 17.44 | (0.5) | -4.35 | (1.6) |
|  | United States | 15.66 | (0.3) | 17.42 | (1.1) | 1.76 | (1.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 13.39 | (0.1) | 12.57 | (0.1) | -0.82 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 33.90 | (1.2) | 28.16 | (0.7) | -5.74 | (1.4) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 18.20 | (0.2) | 15.42 | (0.1) | -2.78 | (0.2) |
|  | Indonesia | m | m | 16.87 | (0.6) | m | m |
|  | Latvia | 12.71 | (0.2) | 9.96 | (0.2) | -2.75 | (0.3) |
|  | Indonesia | m | m | 16.87 | (0.6) | m | m |
|  | Liechtenstein | 7.47 | (0.0) | 8.04 | (0.0) | 0.58 | (0.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 24.51 | (0.0) | 15.68 | (0.0) | -8.84 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 16.28 | (1.0) | 14.26 | (0.2) | -2.03 | (1.1) |
|  | Thailand | 22.79 | (0.6) | 20.25 | (0.4) | -2.54 | (0.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 19.42 | (0.3) | 12.21 | (0.7) | -7.21 | (0.8) |
|  | Uruguay | 17.84 | (0.8) | 15.48 | (0.3) | -2.37 | (0.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher shortage
Table IV.3.37 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 <br> (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a lack of the following: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a lack of the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a lack of the following: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean index S.E. | \% S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. in | Mean index S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Dif. S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| 4 | Australia | 0.28 (0.05) | 30.1 (3.0) | 25.6 | (2.8) | 13.7 | (2.2) | 0.20 (0.04) | 24.9 | (1.5) | 31.8 | (1.7) | 12.4 | (1.2) | -0.08 (0.06) | -5.3 | (3.4) | 6.2 | (3.2) | -1.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Austria | -0.50 (0.06) | 6.1 (1.8) | 10.9 | (2.3) | 4.5 | (1.6) | -0.13 (0.09) | 16.4 | (3.2) | 13.5 | (3.1) | 13.8 | (2.8) | 0.37 (0.11) | 10.3 | (3.7) | 2.6 | (3.8) | 9.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Belgium | 0.42 (0.07) | $36.0 \quad$ (3.0) | 26.4 | (2.6) | 20.3 | (2.8) | 0.26 (0.06) | 20.9 | (2.9) | 24.8 | (2.8) | 9.5 | (1.9) | -0.16 (0.09) | -15.1 | (4.1) | -1.6 | (3.8) | -10.8 | (3.4) |
|  | Canada | 0.00 (0.05) | 19.0 (2.0) | 17.7 | (1.4) | 7.3 | (1.0) | -0.30 (0.04) | 7.1 | (0.8) | 12.8 | (1.7) | 3.7 | (0.7) | -0.29 (0.06) | -11.9 | (2.1) | -4.9 | (2.2) | -3.6 | 1.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.18 (0.04) | 10.4 (2.2) | 15.2 | (2.4) | 6.3 | (1.7) | -0.42 (0.05) | 3.9 | (0.9) | 5.4 | (1.6) | 1.2 | (0.7) | -0.61 (0.06) | -6.5 | (2.4) | -9.8 | (2.9) | -5.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Denmark | -0.12 (0.06) | 3.7 (1.5) | 13.5 | (2.9) | 4.2 | (1.7) | -0.18 (0.05) | 7.1 | (1.8) | 3.2 | (1.0) | 2.1 | (1.1) | -0.06 (0.08) | 3.4 | (2.3) | -10.3 | (3.0) | -2.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Finland | -0.56 (0.05) | 6.5 (1.5) | 4.0 | (1.3) | 6.5 | (2.0) | -0.44 (0.04) | 3.9 | (1.3) | 4.3 | (1.3) | 1.3 | (0.4) | 0.12 (0.06) | -2.6 | (1.9) | 0.4 | (1.8) | -5.2 | (2.0) |
|  | France | w w | w w | w | w | w | w | -0.18 (0.06) | 4.8 | (1.7) | 8.2 | (2.3) | 7.4 | (1.9) | m m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 0.40 (0.08) | 27.7 (3.2) | 40.5 | (3.2) | 20.7 | (2.8) | 0.42 (0.06) | 38.4 | (3.3) | 18.1 | (2.8) | 6.8 | (1.8) | 0.02 (0.10) | 10.7 | (4.6) | -22.4 | (4.3) | -14.0 | (3.3) |
|  | Greece | 0.33 (0.19) | $30.4 \quad(5.8)$ | 31.6 | (5.8) | 29.6 | (5.7) | -0.42 (0.07) | 9.3 | (2.3) | 5.3 | (1.5) | 6.8 | (1.8) | -0.75 (0.20) | -21.1 | (6.2) | -26.3 | (6.0) | -22.9 | (6.0) |
|  | Hungary | -0.41 (0.06) | 7.4 (2.0) | 7.2 | (2.1) | 3.0 | (1.4) | -0.65 (0.05) | 7.0 | (1.9) | 2.7 | (1.3) | 1.2 | (0.9) | -0.24 (0.08) | -0.4 | (2.8) | -4.5 | (2.5) | -1.8 | (1.7) |
|  | Iceland | 0.27 (0.00) | 29.0 (0.2) | 42.7 | (0.2) | 14.3 | (0.1) | 0.18 (0.00) | 28.0 | (0.2) | 23.4 | (0.2) | 9.3 | (0.1) | -0.09 (0.01) | -1.0 | (0.3) | -19.3 | (0.3) | -5.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | -0.08 (0.08) | $13.4 \quad$ (2.9) | 10.4 | (2.6) | 4.8 | (1.9) | -0.15 (0.06) | 5.6 | (1.9) | 14.0 | (3.0) | 4.6 | (1.8) | -0.07 (0.10) | -7.8 | (3.4) | 3.6 | (3.9) | -0.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Italy | 0.26 (0.08) | 19.6 (2.5) | 18.8 | (2.9) | 17.3 | (2.6) | 0.25 (0.04) | 14.4 | (1.8) | 15.6 | (1.7) | 14.7 | (1.5) | -0.01 (0.09) | -5.2 | (3.1) | -3.2 | (3.4) | -2.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Japan | -0.03 (0.13) | $20.6 \quad(3.8)$ | 21.2 | (3.8) | 18.7 | (3.5) | -0.29 (0.07) | 9.4 | (2.3) | 8.3 | (1.9) | 3.5 | (1.1) | -0.25 (0.15) | -11.2 | (4.4) | -12.9 | (4.3) | -15.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Korea | -0.57 (0.07) | 2.7 (1.3) | 4.0 | (1.6) | 1.5 | (1.0) | 0.06 (0.08) | 13.6 | (2.4) | 12.1 | (2.4) | 13.2 | (2.7) | 0.64 (0.11) | 10.9 | (2.7) | 8.0 | (2.9) | 11.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.91 (0.00) | $59.7 \quad(0.1)$ | 13.2 | (0.0) | 63.6 | (0.1) | 1.12 (0.00) | 71.1 | (0.1) | 68.9 | (0.1) | 17.9 | (0.1) | 0.21 (0.00) | 11.5 | (0.1) | 55.6 | (0.1) | -45.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 0.77 (0.07) | 35.8 (3.0) | 36.3 | (3.4) | 36.6 | (3.4) | 0.53 (0.04) | 22.9 | (1.6) | 28.3 | (1.7) | 25.5 | (1.7) | -0.24 (0.08) | -12.9 | (3.4) | -8.1 | (3.8) | -11.2 | (3.8) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.22 (0.08) | $21.9 \quad(3.2)$ | 25.6 | (3.9) | 15.6 | (3.1) | 0.60 (0.08) | 32.0 | (3.6) | 45.3 | (4.0) | 22.8 | (3.3) | 0.38 (0.11) | 10.1 | (4.8) | 19.7 | (5.6) | 7.2 | (4.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.63 (0.06) | 41.1 (3.1) | 32.3 | (2.9) | 27.6 | (2.7) | 0.08 (0.07) | 14.7 | (2.4) | 21.7 | (3.0) | 7.3 | (2.0) | -0.55 (0.09) | -26.4 | (3.9) | -10.6 | (4.2) | -20.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Norway | 0.32 (0.06) | 14.7 (2.9) | 19.7 | (3.3) | 10.7 | (2.3) | 0.31 (0.07) | 13.3 | (2.7) | 18.8 | (2.9) | 20.1 | (3.3) | -0.01 (0.09) | -1.4 | (4.0) | -0.9 | (4.4) | 9.5 | (4.0) |
|  | Poland | 0.13 (0.09) | 14.9 (3.1) | 10.6 | (2.5) | 9.3 | (2.4) | -1.02 (0.02) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | -1.15 (0.10) | -14.1 | (3.1) | -10.6 | C | -9.3 | c |
|  | Portugal | -0.72 (0.07) | 5.9 (2.3) | 4.0 | (1.5) | 4.8 | (1.7) | -0.80 (0.06) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 0.8 | (0.8) | -0.09 (0.09) | -4.7 | (2.5) | -3.2 | (1.7) | -4.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.18 (0.04) | 5.7 (1.5) | 9.8 | (1.9) | 4.9 | (1.2) | -0.34 (0.05) | 5.0 | (1.2) | 5.3 | (1.4) | 2.2 | (0.8) | -0.16 (0.07) | -0.7 | (1.9) | -4.4 | (2.4) | -2.7 | (1.4) |
|  | Spain | -0.44 (0.09) | 10.1 (2.3) | 9.1 | (2.5) | 9.7 | (2.4) | -0.73 (0.03) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.8) | 1.3 | (0.6) | -0.29 (0.09) | -8.0 | (2.3) | -6.9 | (2.6) | -8.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Sweden | 0.24 (0.08) | 16.8 (2.9) | 21.7 | (2.6) | 17.9 | (2.8) | -0.06 (0.07) | 20.0 | (2.6) | 14.2 | (2.6) | 4.1 | (1.6) | -0.30 (0.10) | 3.3 | (3.8) | -7.5 | (3.7) | -13.8 | (3.2) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.18 (0.08) | 8.8 (2.1) | 15.7 | (2.9) | 9.6 | (2.3) | 0.05 (0.06) | 23.2 | (2.6) | 14.2 | (2.4) | 3.6 | (1.0) | 0.23 (0.09) | 14.4 | (3.4) | -1.5 | (3.8) | -6.0 | (2.5) |
|  | Turkey | 2.21 (0.10) | 84.4 (3.0) | 77.0 | (3.8) | 77.6 | (4.0) | 0.88 (0.06) | 41.9 | (4.0) | 30.6 | (3.5) | 27.6 | (3.5) | -1.33 (0.12) | -42.4 | (5.0) | -46.4 | (5.1) | -50.0 | (5.3) |
|  | United States | -0.01 (0.07) | 22.0 (2.8) | 22.3 | (2.9) | 5.8 | (1.6) | -0.42 (0.07) | 9.4 | (2.1) | 9.2 | (2.1) | 2.3 | (1.0) | -0.41 (0.10) | -12.6 | (3.5) | -13.1 | (3.6) | -3.5 | (1.9) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.13 (0.01) | 21.6 (0.5) | 21.0 | (0.5) | 16.7 | (0.5) | -0.05 (0.01) | 16.7 | (0.4) | 16.2 | (0.4) | 8.5 | (0.3) | -0.18 (0.02) | -4.9 | (0.6) | -4.7 | (0.7) | -8.1 | (0.6) |


| \% | Brazil | 0.47 (0.11) | 33.3 | (3.4) | 29.6 | (3.2) | 24.4 | (3.3) | 0.19 (0.05) | 21.8 | (2.2) | 18.3 | (1.9) | 12.8 | (1.7) | -0.27 (0.12) | -11.5 | (4.0) | -11.3 | (3.8) | -11.7 | (3.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | Hong Kong-China | -0.01 (0.07) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 7.1 | (2.0) | 10.0 | (2.6) | -0.23 (0.07) | 3.9 | (1.5) | 10.6 | (2.5) | 5.8 | (1.7) | -0.22 (0.10) | -11.9 | (3.3) | 3.5 | (3.2) | -4.2 | (3.1) |
| $\widetilde{\sim}$ | Indonesia | 1.61 (0.11) | 54.3 | (4.1) | 54.1 | (4.4) | 48.4 | (4.1) | 0.27 (0.08) | 16.2 | (2.9) | 12.8 | (2.4) | 13.1 | (2.7) | -1.35 (0.14) | -38.0 | (5.0) | -41.4 | (5.0) | -35.3 | (4.9) |
|  | Latvia | -0.06 (0.06) | 13.7 | (3.0) | 12.0 | (2.9) | 8.1 | (2.2) | -0.41 (0.06) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 3.3 | (1.5) | 4.6 | (1.6) | -0.35 (0.09) | -7.3 | (3.6) | -8.7 | (3.2) | -3.5 | (2.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.39 (0.01) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.05 (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 7.1 | (0.8) | 0.44 (0.02) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 7.1 | c |
|  | Macao-China | 0.34 (0. | 18.3 | (0.2) | 27.4 | (0.2) | 8.3 | (0.1) | 0.00 (0.00 | 24.1 | (0.0) | 27.5 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.0) | -0.34 (0.00) | 5.8 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 7.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.59 (0.10) | 35.5 | (3.8) | 33.4 | (3.4) | 31.0 | (3.8) | 0.35 (0.07) | 24.3 | (3.4) | 26.5 | (3.3) | 21.5 | (3.4) | -0.24 (0.12) | -11.2 | (5.1) | -6.9 | (4.7) | -9.5 | (5.1) |
|  | Thailand | 0.54 (0.10 | 37.1 | (4.0) | 34.3 | (3.9) | 26.6 | (3.6) | 0.94 (0.08) | 47.4 | (3.6) | 45.5 | (4.1) | 44.4 | (3.9) | 0.40 (0.13) | 10.3 | (5.4) | 11.2 | (5.6) | 17.9 | (5.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 0.23 (0.07) | 28.9 | (3.8) | 16.6 | (3.0) | 6.3 | (2.1) | -0.11 (0.07) | 12.3 | (2.6) | 10.0 | (2.6) | 9.3 | (2.4) | -0.33 (0.10) | -16.6 | (4.6) | -6.6 | (3.9) | 3.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.79 (0.09) | 55.9 | (3.8) | 43.5 | (3.8) | 27.7 | (3.2) | 0.35 (0.07) | 26.3 | (3.1) | 33.9 | (3.4) | 12.6 | (2.3) | -0.45 (0.12) | -29.6 | (4.9) | -9.6 | (5.1) | -15.2 | (3.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher shortage have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table


［Part 1／1］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of physical infrastructure

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 <br> （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school＇s capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following： |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school＇s capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following： |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school＇s capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following： |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean <br> index S．E． | \％S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | Mean index S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | Dif．S．E． | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S．E． | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \mathrm{mf.} \end{gathered}$ | S．E． |
| O | Australia | －0．11（0．06） | 10.7 （2．0） | 4.7 | （1．1） | 5.9 | （1．4） | 0.17 （0．04） | 5.7 | （1．0） | 3.8 | （0．6） | 4.0 | （0．8） | 0.28 （0．07） | －5．0 | （2．2） | －0．8 | （1．3） | －1．9 | （1．6） |
|  | Austria | －0．15（0．10） | $22.0 \quad$（3．7） | 6.9 | （2．1） | 15.7 | （3．0） | －0．16（0．09） | 10.2 | （2．4） | 6.3 | （2．3） | 17.7 | （3．5） | 0.00 （0．14） | －11．8 | （4．5） | －0．7 | （3．1） | 2.0 | （4．7） |
|  | Belgium | －0．21（0．07） | $16.2 \quad$（2．6） | 6.6 | （1．7） | 11.4 | （2．0） | －0．15（0．06） | 12.5 | （2．0） | 4.1 | （1．2） | 7.5 | （1．7） | 0.06 （0．09） | －3．7 | （3．3） | －2．4 | （2．0） | －3．9 | （2．7） |
|  | Canada | －0．10（0．04） | 7.2 （1．3） | 4.6 | （0．9） | 6.4 | （1．1） | 0.32 （0．04） | 3.2 | （0．7） | 2.6 | （0．8） | 3.2 | （0．9） | 0.42 （0．06） | －4．0 | （1．4） | －2．0 | （1．2） | －3．3 | （1．5） |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.30 （0．06） | 3.2 （1．3） | 0.7 | （0．5） | 1.1 | （0．7） | 0.45 （0．06） | 1.6 | （0．9） | 3.1 | （1．3） | 2.3 | （1．2） | 0.14 （0．08） | －1．6 | （1．6） | 2.4 | （1．4） | 1.2 | （1．4） |
|  | Denmark | －0．48（0．07） | $13.0 \quad$（2．5） | 6.9 | （2．1） | 16.2 | （3．0） | －0．17（0．05） | 6.4 | （1．6） | 2.2 | （0．9） | 6.8 | （1．5） | 0.31 （0．09） | －6．6 | （3．0） | －4．6 | （2．3） | －9．4 | （3．4） |
|  | Finland | －0．55（0．08） | 14.3 （2．9） | 13.9 | （2．9） | 9.2 | （2．2） | －0．32（0．07） | 11.7 | （2．3） | 7.3 | （1．7） | 8.1 | （2．0） | 0.24 （0．10） | －2．7 | （3．7） | －6．6 | （3．4） | －1．1 | （3．0） |
|  | France | w w | w w | w | w | w | w | 0.19 （0．07） | 6.1 | （1．7） | 3.1 | （1．4） | 2.7 | （1．1） | m m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | －0．15（0．09） | 15.8 （2．6） | 8.6 | （1．8） | 14.5 | （2．6） | －0．03（0．06） | 7.9 | （2．0） | 3.7 | （1．5） | 10.6 | （2．3） | 0.12 （0．11） | －7．9 | （3．3） | －4．9 | （2．4） | －3．9 | （3．5） |
|  | Greece | －0．74（0．14） | 33.3 （4．7） | 19.8 | （3．8） | 30.8 | （5．1） | －0．19（0．08） | 18.1 | （3．6） | 6.0 | （1．8） | 12.1 | （2．6） | 0.56 （0．16） | －15．2 | （5．9） | －13．8 | （4．2） | －18．6 | （5．7） |
|  | Hungary | －0．49（0．08） | 17.2 （3．1） | 10.2 | （2．3） | 27.6 | （3．3） | 0.21 （0．07） | 3.0 | （1．3） | 2.6 | （1．3） | 4.2 | （1．5） | 0.70 （0．11） | －14．2 | （3．3） | －7．5 | （2．7） | －23．4 | （3．6） |
|  | Iceland | 0.05 （0．00） | 10.3 （0．1） | 2.1 | （0．0） | 10.5 | （0．1） | 0.34 （0．00） | 7.5 | （0．1） | 0.0 | c | 2.2 | （0．1） | 0.29 （0．01） | －2．8 | （0．1） | －2．1 | c | －8．3 | （0．1） |
|  | Ireland | －0．59（0．10） | 36.0 （4．0） | 12.3 | （3．0） | 27.2 | （4．0） | －0．03（0．09） | 26.1 | （3．8） | 5.8 | （2．1） | 18.2 | （3．4） | 0.56 （0．14） | －9．9 | （5．6） | －6．5 | （3．6） | －8．9 | （5．2） |
|  | Italy | －0．33（0．08） | 19.7 （2．8） | 8.3 | （2．2） | 18.1 | （2．8） | －0．33（0．04） | 17.9 | （1．6） | 10.0 | （1．1） | 13.0 | （1．4） | 0.00 （0．09） | －1．8 | （3．2） | 1.8 | （2．5） | －5．1 | （3．2） |
|  | Japan | －0．39（0．10） | $16.7 \quad$（3．5） | 13.8 | （3．1） | 14.1 | （3．1） | －0．13（0．07） | 14.9 | （2．4） | 8.1 | （1．8） | 9.4 | （2．3） | 0.26 （0．12） | －1．8 | （4．2） | －5．7 | （3．6） | －4．7 | （3．9） |
|  | Korea | 0.31 （0．07） | 4.3 （1．7） | 4.2 | （1．7） | 3.2 | （0．9） | －0．18（0．08） | 10.1 | （2．6） | 4.3 | （1．8） | 14.7 | （2．9） | －0．49（0．10） | 5.8 | （3．2） | 0.1 | （2．5） | 11.5 | （3．1） |
|  | Luxembourg | －0．46（0．00） | 24.8 （0．1） | 4.9 | （0．0） | 16.2 | （0．1） | －0．49（0．00） | 25.7 | （0．1） | 2.1 | （0．0） | 19.1 | （0．1） | －0．03（0．00） | 0.9 | （0．1） | －2．9 | （0．1） | 2.9 | （0．1） |
|  | Mexico | －0．40（0．07） | 17.1 （2．2） | 17.8 | （2．4） | 15.0 | （2．3） | －0．40（0．04） | 14.7 | （1．5） | 21.9 | （1．3） | 11.3 | （1．3） | 0.00 （0．08） | －2．4 | （2．6） | 4.1 | （2．7） | －3．7 | （2．6） |
|  | Netherlands | 0.00 （0．10） | $15.0 \quad$（3．3） | 7.7 | （2．1） | 12.2 | （2．8） | －0．29（0．08） | 10.1 | （2．3） | 12.5 | （2．3） | 13.3 | （3．1） | －0．28（0．12） | －4．8 | （4．0） | 4.8 | （3．1） | 1.1 | （4．2） |
|  | New Zealand | －0．04（0．05） | 6.5 （1．8） | 1.8 | （0．9） | 6.3 | （1．3） | 0.03 （0．09） | 10.4 | （3．3） | 1.2 | （0．7） | 9.8 | （3．1） | 0.07 （0．10） | 4.0 | （3．8） | －0．6 | （1．1） | 3.5 | （3．3） |
|  | Norway | －0．83（0．07） | 22.8 （3．5） | 20.7 | （3．0） | 15.3 | （2．6） | －0．31（0．08） | 9.3 | （2．1） | 12.4 | （2．5） | 6.8 | （2．1） | 0.52 （0．10） | －13．5 | （4．0） | －8．3 | （4．0） | －8．5 | （3．3） |
|  | Poland | 0.00 （0．08） | $15.0 \quad(2.8)$ | 2.6 | （1．3） | 7.2 | （2．2） | 0.50 （0．07） | 4.2 | （1．7） | 2.2 | （1．2） | 2.8 | （1．4） | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}(0.10)$ | －10．8 | （3．3） | －0．4 | （1．8） | －4．4 | （2．6） |
|  | Portugal | －0．27（0．08） | 12.1 （3．2） | 9.7 | （2．3） | 7.7 | （2．6） | －0．26（0．09） | 7.8 | （2．3） | 12.3 | （2．9） | 5.8 | （1．8） | 0.00 （0．12） | －4．3 | （3．9） | 2.6 | （3．7） | －1．9 | （3．2） |
|  | Slovak Republic | －0．63（0．05） | 23.4 | 11.1 | （2．4） | 17.1 | （2．3） | －0．13（0．07） | 12.9 | （2．4） | 8.4 | （2．1） | 4.3 | （1．3） | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}(0.09)$ | －10．5 | （3．8） | －2．7 | （3．2） | －12．7 | （2．6） |
|  | Spain | －0．16（0．07） | $14.2 \quad$（2．7） | 9.3 | （2．5） | 12.3 | （2．1） | 0.01 （0．05） | 10.2 | （1．8） | 6.7 | （1．5） | 10.7 | （1．8） | 0.17 （0．09） | －3．9 | （3．3） | －2．6 | （2．9） | －1．5 | （2．7） |
|  | Sweden | －0．27（0．07） | 16.1 （2．6） | 3.6 | （1．4） | 9.5 | （2．0） | 0.21 （0．08） | 6.8 | （1．9） | 4.5 | （1．6） | 4.6 | （1．4） | 0.48 （0．11） | －9．3 | （3．3） | 0.9 | （2．1） | －4．9 | （2．5） |
|  | Switzerland | 0.11 （0．06） | 5.7 （1．6） | 2.5 | （1．2） | 6.1 | （1．7） | 0.29 （0．05） | 4.6 | （1．4） | 1.0 | （0．4） | 3.7 | （1．2） | 0.19 （0．08） | －1．1 | （2．1） | －1．5 | （1．3） | －2．4 | （2．1） |
|  | Turkey | －1．48（0．10） | 48.2 （4．9） | 50.0 | （5．1） | 45.2 | （5．1） | －0．25（0．07） | 22.8 | （3．2） | 7.5 | （2．0） | 17.4 | （2．7） | 1.22 （0．12） | －25．3 | （5．8） | －42．5 | （5．5） | －27．9 | （5．7） |
|  | United States | 0.01 （0．07） | 6.8 （1．7） | 2.7 | （1．1） | 7.9 | （2．0） | 0.46 （0．06） | 2.4 | （1．2） | 0.0 |  | 5.1 | （2．2） | 0.45 （0．09） | －4．5 | （2．1） | －2．7 |  | －2．8 | （2．9） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | －0．29（0．01） | 16.7 （0．5） | 9.6 | （0．4） | 13.9 | （0．5） | －0．03（0．01） | 10.7 | （0．4） | 5.8 | （0．3） | 8.9 | （0．4） | 0.26 （0．02） | －6．0 | （0．7） | －3．8 | （0．6） | －5．0 | （0．6） |


| 告 | Brazil | －0．35（0．10） | 23.6 | （3．5） | 21.9 | （3．2） | 19.8 | （3．3） | －0．35（0．05） | 17.8 | （1．9） | 26.8 | （2．2） | 9.5 | （1．5） | 0.00 （0．11） | －5．7 | （4．0） | 4.9 | （3．9） | －10．3 | （3．6） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong－China | －0．31（0．07） | 20.4 | （3．5） | 1.6 | （1．1） | 18.7 | （3．4） | －0．02（0．07） | 13.5 | （3．1） | 0.5 | （0．5） | 10.3 | （2．7） | 0.28 （0．10） | －6．9 | （4．7） | －1．0 | （1．2） | －8．4 | （4．4） |
|  | Indonesia | －0．86（0．08） | 38.6 | （4．3） | 18.9 | （3．0） | 46.4 | （4．1） | －0．52（0．08） | 10.3 | （2．8） | 40.5 | （4．6） | 5.2 | （1．8） | 0.34 （0．12） | －28．3 | （5．1） | 21.6 | （5．5） | －41．2 | 4．5） |
|  | Latvia | －0．24（0．08） | 6.9 | （2．1） | 9.3 | （2．5） | 7.7 | （2．2） | 0.38 （0．06） | 3.5 | 4） | 2.4 | （1．2） | 1.6 | （1．0） | 0.61 （0．10） | －3．4 | （2．5） | －7．0 | （2．8） | －6．1 | 2．4） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.27 （0．01） | 1.2 | （0．0） | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.11 （0．02） | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  | －0．16（0．02） | －1．2 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  |
|  | Macao－China | －0．57（0．00） | 32.5 | （0．2） | 3.9 | （0．1） | 21.0 | （0．2） | －0．11（0．00） | 17.2 | （0．1） | 3.5 | （0．0） | 15.2 | （0．0） | 0.46 （0．00） | －15．2 | （0．2） | －0．4 | （0．1） | －5．8 | （0．2） |
|  | Russian Federation | －0．40（0．11） | 15.3 | （3．3） | 19.3 | （3．0） | 10.8 | （2．5） | 0.17 （0．07） | 8.2 | （1．9） | 3.8 | （1．3） | 4.4 | （1．6） | 0.56 （0．13） | －7．2 | （3．8） | －15．4 | （3．2） | －6．4 | （3．0） |
|  | Thailand | －0．30（0．08） | 14.6 | （2．4） | 10.4 | （2．3） | 8.1 | （1．9） | －0．87（0．08） | 31.4 | （3．6） | 16.7 | （2．8） | 31.4 | （3．6） | －0．58（0．11） | 16.8 | （4．3 | 6.2 | （3．7） | 23.3 | （4．1） |
|  | Tunisia | －0．66（0．07） | 25.2 | （3．8） | 32.4 | （3．9） | 6.0 | （2．0） | －1．25（0．08） | 33.1 | （4．0） | 63.7 | （3．9） | 20.4 | （3．3） | －0．59（0．11） | 7.9 | （5．5） | 31.4 | （5．5） | 14.3 | （3．9） |
|  | Uruguay | －0．98（0．07） | 25.1 | （4．0） | 43.0 | （3．8） | 28.5 | （3．7） | －0．41（0．09） | 18.4 | （2．9） | 20.8 | （3．0） | 19.8 | （2．9） | 0.57 （0．12） | －6．6 | （4．9） | －22．2 | （4．9） | －8．8 | （4．7） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
For comparability over time，PISA 2003 values on the index of quality of physical infrastructure have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index．PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow＇s World：First Results from PISA 2003 （OECD，2004）（see Annex A5 for more details）．
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources
Table IV.3.43 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Science laboratory equipment | Instructional materials (e.g. textbooks) |  | Computers for instruction |  | Computer software for instruction |  | Library materials |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  | 0.27 | (0.07) | 9.5 | (1.7) | 2.2 | (0.9) | 13.1 | (1.8) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 3.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Austria | 0.06 | (0.08) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 11.6 | (2.7) | 2.9 | (1.4) | 6.5 | (2.1) |
|  | Belgium | -0.12 | (0.06) | 8.2 | (1.9) | 11.2 | (2.2) | 25.0 | (3.0) | 4.0 | (1.3) | 10.5 | (2.1) |
|  | Canada | -0.34 | (0.05) | 8.0 | (1.1) | 2.5 | (0.8) | 14.6 | (1.5) | 4.5 | (1.1) | 10.8 | (1.3) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.41 | (0.06) | 19.8 | (2.0) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 5.0 | (1.4) | 3.8 | (1.2) | 22.9 | (3.0) |
|  | Denmark | -0.32 | (0.07) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 5.0 | (1.7) | 2.7 | (1.2) | 4.0 | (1.6) |
|  | Finland | -0.37 | (0.06) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 7.9 | (2.0) | 0.8 | (0.7) | 4.6 | (1.7) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | -0.13 | (0.08) | 10.6 | (2.4) | 4.6 | (1.4) | 44.1 | (3.9) | 6.5 | (1.6) | 8.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Greece | -0.78 | (0.13) | 11.0 | (3.2) | 21.5 | (5.0) | 10.7 | (3.9) | 23.3 | (4.5) | 21.2 | (4.2) |
|  | Hungary | -0.24 | (0.08) | 1.0 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 9.4 | (2.4) | 1.5 | (1.1) | 28.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Iceland | -0.03 | (0.00) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 7.5 | (0.1) | 3.4 | (0.0) | 1.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | -0.36 | (0.08) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 2.6 | (0.9) | 50.5 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 21.7 | (3.7) |
|  | Italy | -0.16 | (0.07) | 4.1 | (1.5) | 4.5 | (1.3) | 10.3 | (2.2) | 6.5 | (1.9) | 6.8 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | -0.25 | (0.10) | 8.2 | (2.3) | 5.5 | (1.9) | 0.0 | c | 8.9 | (2.4) | 9.6 | (2.5) |
|  | Korea | 0.38 | (0.06) | 3.8 | (1.6) | 2.0 | (1.2) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.04 | (0.00) | 13.1 | (0.0) | 10.9 | (0.0) | 15.3 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | -0.69 | (0.09) | 8.6 | (1.9) | 9.3 | (2.2) | 20.8 | (2.8) | 11.3 | (2.1) | 15.4 | (2.4) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.15 | (0.06) | 5.6 | (2.1) | 8.0 | (2.5) | 27.1 | (3.7) | 1.0 | (0.7) | 2.8 | (1.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.00 | (0.06) | 6.2 | (1.4) | 7.8 | (1.5) | 8.2 | (1.6) | 2.7 | (1.4) | 5.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Norway | -0.70 | (0.05) | 3.1 | (1.3) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 4.9 | (1.7) | 2.7 | (1.3) | 5.5 | (1.6) |
|  | Poland | -1.02 | (0.07) | 19.0 | (3.3) | 5.3 | (1.8) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 18.4 | (2.8) | 16.5 | (2.8) |
|  | Portugal | -0.35 | (0.07) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 5.2 | (1.9) | 5.4 | (1.9) | 1.1 | (0.9) | 3.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -1.10 | (0.05) | 11.4 | (1.9) | 0.8 | (0.6) | 5.1 | (1.5) | 19.9 | (2.7) | 53.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Spain | -0.41 | (0.07) | 5.6 | (1.8) | 6.4 | (2.1) | 16.8 | (2.5) | 6.3 | (1.8) | 7.5 | (1.5) |
|  | Sweden | -0.31 | (0.07) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 3.9 | (1.4) | 8.2 | (2.1) | 4.9 | (1.7) | 3.9 | (1.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.20 | (0.07) | 3.1 | (1.5) | 3.9 | (1.6) | 7.0 | (1.4) | 2.6 | (1.3) | 2.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Turkey | -1.91 | (0.11) | 41.7 | (4.2) | 51.1 | (4.4) | 22.2 | (4.3) | 51.4 | (4.4) | 42.1 | (3.8) |
|  | United States | 0.25 | (0.09) | 2.8 | (1.0) | 2.3 | (1.2) | 8.2 | (1.5) | 2.0 | (0.9) | 6.9 | (2.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.31 | (0.01) | 7.9 | (0.4) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 13.4 | (0.5) | 7.0 | (0.4) | 11.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Brazil | -1.17 | (0.10) | 17.9 | (3.3) | 11.4 | (2.4) | 31.9 | (3.5) | 20.3 | (2.7) | 29.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.03 | (0.08) | 2.2 | (2.2) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 3.4 | (1.5) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 1.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Indonesia | -1.08 | (0.09) | 36.2 | (3.8) | 43.0 | (4.0) | 13.2 | (2.3) | 47.9 | (3.9) | 38.9 | (3.7) |
|  | Latvia | -0.80 | (0.07) | 4.3 | (1.7) | 1.0 | (1.0) | 9.9 | (2.7) | 9.4 | (2.3) | 16.1 | (2.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 9.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.46 | (0.00) | 2.4 | (0.0) | 13.0 | (0.2) | 3.2 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Russian Federation | -1.58 | (0.08) | 16.3 | (2.7) | 10.3 | (2.8) | 24.3 | (3.9) | 27.6 | (3.6) | 27.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Thailand | -0.82 | (0.10) | 11.7 | (2.7) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 16.4 | (2.9) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 13.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.68 | (0.07) | 6.8 | (2.1) | 6.3 | (1.9) | 24.5 | (3.0) | 5.1 | (1.8) | 3.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Uruguay | -1.21 | (0.09) | 18.5 | (3.4) | 14.3 | (3.2) | 29.7 | (4.5) | 31.8 | (3.8) | 46.2 | (4.0) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of quality of schools' educational resources have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources
Table IV.3.43 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Science laboratory equipment | Instructional materials (e.g. textbooks) |  | Computers for instruction |  | Computer software for instruction |  | Library materials |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | 0.68 | (0.03) | 1.7 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | 0.22 | (0.09) | 18.5 | (3.3) | 1.7 | (1.0) | 10.2 | (2.5) | 2.9 | (1.3) | 2.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Belgium | 0.30 | (0.06) | 3.2 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 6.1 | (1.6) | 2.9 | (1.1) | 4.6 | (1.2) |
|  | Canada | 0.27 | (0.04) | 2.1 | (0.9) | 1.0 | (0.6) | 5.8 | (1.4) | 2.7 | (0.8) | 1.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.05 | (0.06) | 7.4 | (2.0) | 1.6 | (0.8) | 2.5 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 6.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Denmark | -0.15 | (0.05) | 2.5 | (1.3) | 1.8 | (1.5) | 10.8 | (2.2) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 1.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Finland | -0.20 | (0.06) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 11.4 | (2.3) | 6.2 | (1.5) | 5.4 | (1.4) |
|  | France | 0.38 | (0.07) | 2.6 | (1.1) | 0.8 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (1.2) | 2.8 | (1.1) | 2.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Germany | 0.09 | (0.07) | 5.8 | (1.8) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (1.4) | 2.0 | (0.8) | 2.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Greece | -0.35 | (0.07) | 13.0 | (2.7) | 11.7 | (2.6) | 17.8 | (3.2) | 10.4 | (2.5) | 20.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Hungary | 0.17 | (0.06) | 11.8 | (2.7) | 2.8 | (1.3) | 3.2 | (1.3) | 3.5 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Iceland | -0.34 | (0.00) | 14.4 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 20.0 | (0.1) | 5.4 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.11 | (0.08) | 9.4 | (2.4) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 8.8 | (2.4) | 4.8 | (1.9) | 13.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Italy | 0.05 | (0.04) | 8.5 | (1.1) | 1.2 | (0.4) | 3.5 | (0.7) | 5.0 | (0.9) | 5.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Japan | 0.44 | (0.08) | 5.1 | (1.7) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 5.6 | (1.9) | 7.7 | (2.0) | 2.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Korea | 0.06 | (0.08) | 6.5 | (2.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 2.9 | (1.5) | 7.6 | (2.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.04 | (0.00) | 5.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (0.0) | 3.2 | (0.0) | 5.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | -0.86 | (0.04) | 31.0 | (1.7) | 11.1 | (1.2) | 30.9 | (1.9) | 26.5 | (1.6) | 14.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.19 | (0.08) | 4.6 | (1.8) | 0.0 | c | 12.4 | (2.6) | 7.1 | (2.0) | 1.3 | (1.0) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.20 | (0.08) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 6.4 | (2.1) | 0.4 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | -0.19 | (0.06) | 7.8 | (1.9) | 1.1 | (0.8) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 10.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Poland | 0.36 | (0.08) | 4.1 | (1.6) | 0.0 | c | 6.3 | (1.7) | 4.8 | (1.5) | 2.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Portugal | 0.17 | (0.08) | 4.5 | (1.5) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 8.7 | (2.2) | 4.6 | (1.8) | 2.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.54 | (0.05) | 15.4 | (2.5) | 18.4 | (2.7) | 3.3 | (1.1) | 5.8 | (1.8) | 5.2 | (1.6) |
|  | Spain | 0.02 | (0.05) | 5.4 | (1.3) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (1.4) | 4.2 | (1.0) | 2.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Sweden | 0.05 | (0.06) | 2.7 | (1.2) | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (2.7) | 5.2 | (1.7) | 4.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.55 | (0.07) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 4.8 | (1.6) | 1.5 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Turkey | -0.40 | (0.06) | 22.1 | (3.1) | 8.3 | (2.2) | 15.0 | (2.6) | 9.8 | (2.4) | 9.8 | (2.2) |
|  | United States | 0.38 | (0.08) | 4.2 | (1.7) | 3.3 | (1.5) | 5.5 | (1.9) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.05 | (0.01) | 7.9 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 8.7 | (0.4) | 4.9 | (0.3) | 5.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Brazil | -0.54 | (0.05) | 41.2 | (1.9) | 2.9 | (0.7) | 21.6 | (2.2) | 25.6 | (2.3) | 12.5 | (1.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.44 | (0.07) | 1.0 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Indonesia | -0.76 | (0.10) | 28.8 | (3.7) | 9.6 | (2.2) | 23.1 | (3.5) | 21.0 | (3.6) | 13.8 | (3.1) |
|  | Latvia | 0.04 | (0.05) | 7.4 | (1.9) | 4.1 | (1.6) | 7.5 | (2.0) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 4.8 | (1.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.77 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Macao-China | 0.36 | (0.00) | 0.0 | c | 2.4 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 4.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.48 | (0.07) | 17.1 | (2.5) | 3.4 | (1.1) | 12.8 | (2.7) | 12.0 | (1.7) | 5.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Thailand | -0.68 | (0.07) | 26.2 | (3.4) | 2.7 | (1.2) | 14.3 | (2.5) | 15.1 | (2.6) | 19.9 | (2.5) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.34 | (0.08) | 30.8 | (3.7) | 17.3 | (3.1) | 37.0 | (4.6) | 25.3 | (3.9) | 47.9 | (3.6) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.12 | (0.08) | 8.2 | (2.2) | 6.9 | (1.9) | 12.3 | (2.3) | 13.1 | (2.6) | 6.7 | (1.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of quality of schools' educational resources have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).

[Part 3/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources
Table IV.3.43 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered a lot by a shortage or inadequacy of the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Science laboratory equipment | Instructional materials (e.g. textbooks) |  | Computers for instruction |  | Computer software for instruction |  | Library materials |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  | 0.41 | (0.08) | -7.8 | (1.8) | -1.3 | (1.0) | -12.4 | (1.8) | 0.1 | (0.6) | -2.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Austria | 0.16 | (0.12) | 17.1 | (3.4) | 0.8 | (1.2) | -1.4 | (3.6) | 0.0 | (1.9) | -4.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Belgium | 0.42 | (0.09) | -5.0 | (2.3) | -10.6 | (2.2) | -18.9 | (3.4) | -1.1 | (1.7) | -5.9 | (2.4) |
|  | Canada | 0.61 | (0.06) | -5.8 | (1.4) | -1.5 | (1.0) | -8.8 | (2.0) | -1.9 | (1.3) | -9.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.46 | (0.09) | -12.4 | (2.8) | 1.0 | (1.0) | -2.6 | (1.8) | -2.1 | (1.5) | -16.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Denmark | 0.18 | (0.09) | 1.6 | (1.4) | 0.4 | (1.8) | 5.8 | (2.8) | -1.5 | (1.4) | -3.0 | (1.8) |
|  | Finland | 0.17 | (0.08) | 0.8 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 3.5 | (3.0) | 5.5 | (1.6) | 0.8 | (2.2) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 0.22 | (0.10) | -4.9 | (3.0) | -4.6 | c | -39.9 | (4.1) | -4.5 | (1.8) | -5.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Greece | 0.43 | (0.15) | 1.9 | (4.1) | -9.8 | (5.6) | 7.1 | (5.1) | -13.0 | (5.1) | -1.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Hungary | 0.41 | (0.10) | 10.8 | (2.7) | 2.8 | c | -6.2 | (2.7) | 2.0 | (1.8) | -25.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Iceland | -0.31 | (0.01) | 12.2 | (0.2) | -0.6 | c | 12.4 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.47 | (0.11) | 8.1 | (2.6) | -1.3 | (1.3) | -41.7 | (5.2) | 4.0 | (2.0) | -8.0 | (4.7) |
|  | Italy | 0.20 | (0.08) | 4.4 | (1.9) | -3.3 | (1.4) | -6.8 | (2.3) | -1.5 | (2.1) | -1.2 | (2.3) |
|  | Japan | 0.69 | (0.13) | -3.1 | (2.9) | -5.0 | (2.0) | 5.6 | c | -1.2 | (3.1) | -7.2 | (2.7) |
|  | Korea | -0.32 | (0.10) | 2.8 | (2.7) | -1.4 | (1.3) | 0.7 | (1.9) | 2.2 | (1.6) | 7.0 | (2.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.07 | (0.00) | -7.6 | (0.1) | -10.9 | c | -9.2 | (0.1) | 3.2 | c | 0.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | -0.16 | (0.10) | 22.3 | (2.6) | 1.8 | (2.5) | 10.1 | (3.4) | 15.2 | (2.6) | -0.9 | (2.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.04 | (0.10) | -1.0 | (2.8) | -8.0 | c | -14.8 | (4.5) | 6.1 | (2.1) | -1.5 | (2.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.20 | (0.10) | -5.0 | (1.6) | -6.9 | (1.5) | -1.8 | (2.7) | -2.4 | (1.5) | -5.6 | (1.8) |
|  | Norway | 0.51 | (0.08) | 4.7 | (2.3) | 0.4 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (2.3) | -0.8 | (1.7) | 5.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Poland | 1.38 | (0.10) | -14.9 | (3.7) | -5.3 | c | -2.2 | (2.7) | -13.6 | (3.2) | -14.1 | (3.1) |
|  | Portugal | 0.52 | (0.11) | 3.3 | (1.7) | -4.3 | (2.0) | 3.2 | (2.9) | 3.5 | (2.0) | -1.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.55 | (0.07) | 4.0 | (3.2) | 17.6 | (2.8) | -1.7 | (1.9) | -14.0 | (3.2) | -48.7 | (3.7) |
|  | Spain | 0.43 | (0.09) | -0.2 | (2.2) | -6.0 | (2.1) | -6.9 | (2.8) | -2.1 | (2.1) | -5.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Sweden | 0.36 | (0.09) | -6.2 | (2.5) | -3.9 | c | 7.7 | (3.5) | 0.3 | (2.4) | 0.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.35 | (0.10) | -1.5 | (1.6) | -2.7 | (1.7) | -2.3 | (2.1) | -1.1 | (1.4) | 0.0 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 1.51 | (0.13) | -19.5 | (5.2) | -42.7 | (4.9) | -7.3 | (5.1) | -41.7 | (5.0) | -32.2 | (4.4) |
|  | United States | 0.13 | (0.12) | 1.4 | (2.0) | 1.0 | (1.9) | -2.7 | (2.4) | 0.2 | (1.5) | -5.8 | (2.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.36 | (0.02) | 0.0 | (0.5) | -3.6 | (0.5) | -4.7 | (0.6) | -2.1 | (0.5) | -6.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Brazil | 0.63 | (0.11) | 23.2 | (3.8) | -8.5 | (2.5) | -10.2 | (4.1) | 5.3 | (3.5) | -17.0 | (3.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.41 | (0.10) | -1.2 | (2.3) | -0.4 | (1.2) | -1.0 | (1.9) | 1.1 | (1.4) | -0.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.33 | (0.14) | -7.5 | (5.3) | -33.3 | (4.6) | 10.0 | (4.1) | -27.0 | (5.3) | -25.1 | (4.9) |
|  | Latvia | 0.83 | (0.08) | 3.1 | (2.6) | 3.0 | (1.9) | -2.3 | (3.4) | -6.4 | (2.6) | -11.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.24 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | -9.5 | c | 0.0 | c | -1.2 | c |
|  | Macao-China | 0.82 | (0.00) | -2.4 | c | -10.6 | (0.2) | -3.1 | (0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.0 | c |
|  | Russian Federation | 1.10 | (0.11) | 0.8 | (3.7) | -6.9 | (3.0) | -11.5 | (4.7) | -15.6 | (4.0) | -21.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Thailand | 0.14 | (0.12) | 14.5 | (4.3) | -0.3 | (1.8) | -2.1 | (3.8) | -0.7 | (3.9) | 6.4 | (3.8) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.66 | (0.11) | 24.0 | (4.3) | 11.0 | (3.6) | 12.5 | (5.5) | 20.1 | (4.3) | 44.7 | (3.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 1.33 | (0.12) | -10.3 | (4.0) | -7.4 | (3.7) | -17.4 | (5.0) | -18.7 | (4.6) | -39.6 | (4.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of quality of schools' educational resources have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink 侢ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957479
[Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in students' learning time in school
Table IV.3.46 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number <br> of mathematics class <br> periods in a normal full <br> week of school (class <br> periods) <br> 而 |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics (minutes) |  | Number <br> of mathematics class <br> periods in a normal full <br> week of school (class <br> periods) |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics (minutes) |  | Number <br> of mathematics class <br> periods in a normal full <br> week of school (class <br> periods) |  | Time spent per week in regular school lessons in mathematics (minutes) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Dif. | S.E. | Dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 4.5 | (0.1) | 230.3 | (1.7) | 4.3 | (0.0) | 236.3 | (0.9) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 6.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Austria | 3.4 | (0.1) | 166.4 | (4.0) | 3.1 | (0.0) | 156.4 | (2.4) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -9.9 | (4.7) |
|  | Belgium | 3.9 | (0.0) | 196.4 | (2.0) | 4.0 | (0.0) | 216.9 | (1.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 20.5 | (2.5) |
|  | Canada | 3.2 | (0.0) | 222.8 | (2.0) | 4.3 | (0.0) | 313.8 | (2.8) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 91.0 | (3.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 3.7 | (0.1) | 168.8 | (2.3) | 4.0 | (0.0) | 182.3 | (1.9) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 13.5 | (3.0) |
|  | Denmark | 4.3 | (0.0) | 206.4 | (2.4) | 4.4 | (0.0) | 224.4 | (3.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 18.1 | (3.8) |
|  | Finland | 3.5 | (0.1) | 156.1 | (2.6) | 3.7 | (0.0) | 175.5 | (1.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 19.3 | (3.0) |
|  | France | 3.8 | (0.0) | 208.1 | (1.7) | 3.5 | (0.0) | 207.0 | (2.2) | -0.3 | (0.0) | -1.0 | (2.8) |
|  | Germany | 4.0 | (0.0) | 182.3 | (1.9) | 4.0 | (0.0) | 196.8 | (2.6) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 14.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Greece | 4.1 | (0.0) | 186.7 | (2.0) | 4.7 | (0.0) | 209.0 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 22.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Hungary | 3.6 | (0.0) | 162.9 | (2.0) | 3.4 | (0.0) | 149.9 | (1.7) | -0.3 | (0.1) | -13.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Iceland | 5.8 | (0.0) | 254.2 | (1.0) | 5.5 | (0.0) | 243.9 | (1.9) | -0.4 | (0.0) | -10.4 | (2.2) |
|  | Ireland | 4.8 | (0.0) | 190.3 | (1.6) | 4.8 | (0.0) | 188.8 | (1.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | -1.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Italy | 4.0 | (0.1) | 213.3 | (3.1) | 4.1 | (0.0) | 232.0 | (1.7) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 18.7 | (3.6) |
|  | Japan | 4.3 | (0.1) | 216.3 | (4.3) | 4.6 | (0.1) | 234.7 | (3.0) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 18.4 | (5.3) |
|  | Korea | 4.9 | (0.1) | 245.8 | (3.6) | 4.3 | (0.1) | 213.3 | (3.2) | -0.6 | (0.1) | -32.5 | (4.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.0 | (0.0) | 200.3 | (1.5) | 4.0 | (0.0) | 204.7 | (0.8) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.4 | (1.7) |
|  | Mexico | 4.8 | (0.1) | 235.4 | (4.9) | 4.4 | (0.0) | 253.2 | (1.7) | -0.4 | (0.1) | 17.8 | (5.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 3.1 | (0.1) | 149.3 | (2.5) | 3.2 | (0.0) | 170.7 | (2.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 21.4 | (3.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 4.3 | (0.0) | 239.6 | (1.7) | 4.3 | (0.0) | 240.8 | (2.0) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Norway | 3.7 | (0.1) | 165.6 | (4.3) | 3.9 | (0.0) | 199.0 | (2.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 33.4 | (4.9) |
|  | Poland | 4.6 | (0.0) | 205.5 | (1.6) | 4.4 | (0.0) | 198.1 | (1.7) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -7.4 | (2.3) |
|  | Portugal | 3.6 | (0.1) | 195.0 | (3.2) | 3.6 | (0.1) | 288.0 | (4.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 93.0 | (5.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 4.4 | (0.1) | 198.4 | (3.0) | 4.0 | (0.1) | 180.8 | (2.7) | -0.4 | (0.1) | -17.6 | (4.0) |
|  | Spain | 3.3 | (0.0) | 176.0 | (1.4) | 3.8 | (0.0) | 210.3 | (0.9) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 34.4 | (1.7) |
|  | Sweden | 3.2 | (0.1) | 165.0 | (2.4) | 3.1 | (0.0) | 182.2 | (2.2) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 17.2 | (3.2) |
|  | Switzerland | 4.4 | (0.1) | 198.6 | (5.2) | 4.4 | (0.1) | 207.0 | (2.6) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 8.4 | (5.8) |
|  | Turkey | 4.8 | (0.1) | 200.0 | (3.2) | 3.9 | (0.1) | 171.9 | (2.2) | -0.8 | (0.1) | -28.2 | (3.8) |
|  | United States | 3.7 | (0.1) | 221.0 | (3.3) | 4.0 | (0.1) | 254.1 | (4.9) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 33.1 | (6.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 4.1 | (0.0) | 198.5 | (0.5) | 4.1 | (0.0) | 211.8 | (0.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 13.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Brazil | 4.3 | (0.1) | 210.6 | (4.2) | 4.1 | (0.0) | 214.7 | (1.7) | -0.2 | (0.1) | 4.1 | (4.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 7.5 | (0.1) | 269.7 | (3.6) | 6.5 | (0.1) | 267.6 | (2.6) | -1.0 | (0.1) | -2.1 | (4.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 4.9 | (0.1) | 232.5 | (4.5) | 3.8 | (0.1) | 209.4 | (4.5) | -1.1 | (0.1) | -23.2 | (6.4) |
|  | Latvia | 5.3 | (0.1) | 214.1 | (3.0) | 5.5 | (0.0) | 224.4 | (1.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 10.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 4.8 | (0.0) | 215.7 | (1.8) | 4.6 | (0.1) | 210.7 | (4.5) | -0.2 | (0.1) | -5.0 | (4.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 6.7 | (0.1) | 271.8 | (2.7) | 6.7 | (0.0) | 275.0 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.1) | 3.3 | (2.9) |
|  | Russian Federation | 4.8 | (0.1) | 207.3 | (4.0) | 5.0 | (0.1) | 222.5 | (2.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 15.2 | (4.7) |
|  | Thailand | 4.3 | (0.1) | 223.7 | (2.7) | 3.9 | (0.1) | 205.9 | (3.1) | -0.4 | (0.1) | -17.8 | (4.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 4.2 | (0.0) | 249.5 | (1.4) | 3.9 | (0.0) | 275.9 | (4.0) | -0.2 | (0.0) | 26.4 | (4.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 4.3 | (0.1) | 182.9 | (3.5) | 3.6 | (0.0) | 155.8 | (1.9) | -0.8 | (0.1) | -27.1 | (4.0) |

[^29][Part 1/1]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in hours of after-school study time per week
Table IV.3.48 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  | PISA 2012 |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Homework or other study set by teachers per week (hours) |  | Homework or other study set by teachers per week (hours) |  | Homework or other study set by teachers per week (hours) |  |
|  |  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 5.7 | (0.1) | 6.0 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Austria | 4.0 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Belgium | 6.2 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (0.1) | -0.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Canada | 5.6 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (0.1) | -0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 3.8 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.1) | -0.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Denmark | 5.4 | (0.1) | 4.3 | (0.1) | -1.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Finland | 3.7 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.1) | -0.9 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 6.8 | (0.1) | 5.1 | (0.1) | -1.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Germany | 6.3 | (0.1) | 4.7 | (0.1) | -1.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Greece | 8.3 | (0.2) | 5.3 | (0.1) | -3.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Hungary | 10.0 | (0.2) | 6.2 | (0.1) | -3.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Iceland | 4.6 | (0.1) | 4.1 | (0.1) | -0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 7.7 | (0.2) | 7.3 | (0.1) | -0.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Italy | 10.5 | (0.2) | 8.7 | (0.1) | -1.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Japan | 3.8 | (0.2) | 3.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 3.5 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 6.1 | (0.1) | 4.6 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 5.8 | (0.1) | 5.2 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 5.7 | (0.1) | 5.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 4.5 | (0.1) | 4.2 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | 4.8 | (0.1) | 4.7 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Poland | 8.1 | (0.2) | 6.6 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Portugal | 4.9 | (0.1) | 3.8 | (0.1) | -1.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 8.4 | (0.2) | 3.2 | (0.1) | -5.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 7.4 | (0.1) | 6.5 | (0.1) | -0.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Sweden | 3.9 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) | -0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 4.6 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Turkey | 5.9 | (0.2) | 4.2 | (0.1) | -1.6 | (0.2) |
|  | United States | 5.7 | (0.1) | 6.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 5.9 | (0.0) | 4.9 | (0.0) | -1.0 | (0.0) |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { n } \\ \text { ² } \\ \text { N } \end{array}$ | Brazil | 4.9 | (0.1) | 3.3 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.8 | (0.2) | 6.0 | (0.2) | -0.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Indonesia | c | c | 4.9 | (0.2) | c | c |
|  | Latvia | 9.4 | (0.2) | 6.2 | (0.1) | -3.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 4.4 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (0.2) | -1.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 7.8 | (0.2) | 5.9 | (0.1) | -1.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 12.7 | (0.3) | 9.7 | (0.2) | -3.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Thailand | 6.9 | (0.2) | 5.6 | (0.1) | -1.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 4.9 | (0.2) | 3.5 | (0.1) | -1.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 6.8 | (0.1) | 4.7 | (0.1) | -2.1 | (0.2) |

[^30]［Part 1／1］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in pre－school attendance
Table IV．3．50 Results based on students＇self－reports


Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
StatLink 泀定両 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957479
[Part 1/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in years in pre-school, by school features

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom quarterof ESCS |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Second quarter } \\ \text { of ESCS } \end{gathered}$ |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 37.6 | (1.3) | 42.5 | (1.3) | 47.2 | (1.3) | 55.6 | (1.0) | 38.9 | (1.4) | 44.4 | (1.3) | 55.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Austria | 66.1 | (2.2) | 79.0 | (1.7) | 86.1 | (1.5) | 89.5 | (1.3) | 73.3 | (2.1) | 80.7 | (1.8) | 88.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Belgium | 90.1 | (0.9) | 92.6 | (0.6) | 95.9 | (0.5) | 96.7 | (0.4) | 90.3 | (0.8) | 94.8 | (0.5) | 96.1 | (0.4) |
|  | Canada | 35.4 | (1.2) | 40.5 | (1.1) | 49.5 | (1.1) | 57.4 | (1.4) | 32.8 | (1.7) | 46.7 | (1.0) | 56.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 74.7 | (1.6) | 77.7 | (1.1) | 80.9 | (1.2) | 81.9 | (1.1) | 74.6 | (1.7) | 80.5 | (1.1) | 80.0 | (1.3) |
|  | Denmark | 57.9 | (1.9) | 67.7 | (1.9) | 65.9 | (1.5) | 71.3 | (1.7) | 62.4 | (2.8) | 64.5 | (1.2) | 72.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Finland | 58.1 | (1.6) | 65.4 | (1.4) | 69.6 | (1.4) | 73.9 | (1.5) | 55.5 | (2.3) | 66.9 | (1.0) | 78.9 | (1.8) |
|  | France | 91.1 | (0.9) | 93.3 | (0.9) | 94.1 | (0.7) | 97.0 | (0.8) | 90.5 | (1.1) | 94.5 | (0.6) | 96.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Germany | 71.3 | (1.5) | 82.3 | (1.4) | 86.3 | (1.2) | 90.3 | (0.9) | 73.6 | (1.3) | 83.8 | (1.1) | 91.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 58.7 | (2.3) | 59.5 | (2.0) | 62.1 | (1.7) | 67.6 | (2.1) | 58.6 | (2.4) | 61.0 | (2.2) | 66.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Hungary | 92.0 | (1.0) | 94.1 | (0.7) | 93.8 | (0.8) | 97.1 | (0.5) | 92.3 | (0.8) | 94.9 | (0.8) | 95.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Iceland | 82.2 | (1.2) | 88.6 | (1.1) | 91.0 | (0.9) | 93.8 | (0.9) | 81.9 | (1.7) | 89.6 | (0.7) | 91.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Ireland | 25.6 | (1.9) | 30.7 | (1.7) | 34.9 | (1.6) | 38.5 | (2.2) | 28.8 | (2.6) | 29.4 | (1.4) | 44.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Italy | 84.4 | (1.2) | 87.6 | (1.0) | 86.0 | (1.1) | 89.0 | (0.8) | 82.7 | (1.5) | 88.7 | (0.9) | 88.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Japan | 96.6 | (0.6) | 96.9 | (0.5) | 97.5 | (0.5) | 97.2 | (0.5) | 95.8 | (0.5) | 97.2 | (0.5) | 98.1 | (0.4) |
|  | Korea | 79.8 | (1.2) | 86.6 | (1.1) | 89.4 | (0.9) | 90.4 | (0.9) | 82.3 | (1.2) | 87.8 | (0.9) | 89.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 75.7 | (1.5) | 79.2 | (1.4) | 81.2 | (1.2) | 81.0 | (1.3) | 77.4 | (0.9) | c | c | 82.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Mexico | 49.6 | (1.8) | 59.3 | (1.6) | 72.1 | (1.4) | 82.0 | (1.2) | 53.0 | (2.1) | 67.8 | (1.3) | 79.4 | (1.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 93.3 | (1.0) | 93.7 | (0.9) | 93.7 | (0.8) | 95.0 | (0.7) | 92.5 | (1.0) | 94.6 | (0.6) | 94.5 | (0.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 63.8 | (1.3) | 67.8 | (1.5) | 75.1 | (1.5) | 79.9 | (1.5) | 66.1 | (1.6) | 71.3 | (1.1) | 77.4 | (1.7) |
|  | Norway | 68.2 | (1.8) | 77.8 | (1.7) | 80.7 | (1.2) | 86.4 | (1.6) | 75.5 | (3.2) | 77.4 | (1.2) | 86.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Poland | 29.4 | (2.0) | 36.8 | (1.8) | 47.3 | (1.8) | 64.2 | (1.5) | 32.5 | (2.9) | 44.0 | (1.4) | 60.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Portugal | 45.3 | (2.0) | 48.6 | (1.8) | 54.7 | (1.5) | 71.2 | (1.6) | 50.5 | (2.3) | 54.3 | (1.9) | 62.2 | (2.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 67.7 | (2.1) | 78.6 | (0.9) | 79.5 | (1.0) | 79.3 | (1.5) | 72.5 | (2.0) | 76.2 | (1.3) | 80.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | 79.9 | (1.7) | 82.2 | (1.0) | 85.6 | (1.0) | 89.6 | (0.7) | 81.3 | (1.6) | 83.4 | (1.0) | 88.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Sweden | 51.0 | (1.9) | 56.0 | (1.7) | 63.9 | (1.7) | 67.1 | (1.7) | 53.1 | (2.4) | 58.6 | (1.2) | 68.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 63.3 | (2.5) | 66.6 | (2.3) | 66.0 | (2.1) | 70.9 | (2.4) | 58.6 | (3.8) | 69.4 | (2.1) | 70.4 | (3.8) |
|  | Turkey | 0.8 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.6) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 22.1 | (1.4) | 2.5 | (0.5) | 5.5 | (0.7) | 18.2 | (1.3) |
|  | United States | 11.5 | (1.0) | 10.1 | (1.1) | 9.5 | (0.8) | 10.1 | (0.8) | 11.9 | (1.1) | 9.7 | (0.6) | 10.1 | (1.0) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 62.1 | (0.3) | 67.0 | (0.3) | 70.5 | (0.2) | 75.4 | (0.2) | 63.5 | (0.4) | 68.5 | (0.2) | 74.8 | (0.3) |
| \% | Brazil | 31.3 | (1.9) | 39.8 | (1.7) | 48.8 | (1.6) | 59.8 | (2.0) | 34.4 | (2.2) | 42.2 | (1.4) | 64.4 | (2.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 76.0 | (1.3) | 85.6 | (1.9) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 94.5 | (0.7) | 80.1 | (2.2) | 88.8 | (1.1) | 93.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 12.6 | (1.4) | 22.1 | (1.6) | 27.8 | (1.7) | 38.9 | (3.0) | 13.6 | (2.0) | 26.8 | (2.7) | 37.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Latvia | 47.8 | (1.9) | 57.1 | (2.1) | 61.1 | (1.6) | 56.9 | (1.9) | 41.0 | (3.4) | 56.5 | (1.5) | 63.5 | (2.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 79.3 | (4.2) | 97.6 | (1.7) | 92.7 | (2.9) | 92.7 | (2.9) | c | c | 92.5 | (1.8) | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 75.4 | (3.3) | 79.4 | (2.9) | 83.4 | (2.6) | 81.7 | (2.5) | 73.6 | (2.7) | 84.0 | (1.9) | 84.7 | (2.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 72.0 | (2.1) | 79.4 | (1.6) | 82.3 | (1.3) | 80.0 | (1.3) | 72.8 | (2.4) | 80.3 | (1.3) | 81.2 | (1.5) |
|  | Thailand | 63.5 | (2.4) | 69.0 | (1.6) | 76.3 | (1.5) | 88.2 | (1.1) | 66.5 | (2.2) | 72.0 | (1.8) | 88.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 7.8 | (0.9) | 17.3 | (1.3) | 32.9 | (1.7) | 48.8 | (2.2) | 11.5 | (1.2) | 27.0 | (1.5) | 47.0 | (2.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 43.8 | (1.9) | 60.3 | (2.2) | 69.1 | (1.3) | 80.8 | (1.2) | 47.6 | (1.8) | 65.0 | (1.9) | 78.8 | (1.6) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
StatLink 司iाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957479
[Part 2/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in years in pre-school, by school features


Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
StatLink 言ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957479
[Part 3/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in years in pre-school, by school features

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom quarterof ESCS |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Second quarter } \\ \text { of ESCS } \end{gathered}$ |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Socio-economically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically average schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio-economically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 42.7 | (1.1) | 49.0 | (1.0) | 54.1 | (1.0) | 61.6 | (1.1) | 42.3 | (1.1) | 49.9 | (0.8) | 64.3 | (1.3) |
|  | Austria | 80.8 | (1.8) | 86.5 | (1.3) | 90.6 | (1.0) | 93.1 | (0.9) | 82.1 | (1.6) | 88.7 | (0.9) | 93.2 | (1.0) |
|  | Belgium | 89.2 | (0.9) | 92.1 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.4) | 96.1 | (0.5) | 87.3 | (0.9) | 94.6 | (0.6) | 96.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Canada | 42.5 | (1.1) | 46.9 | (1.2) | 52.1 | (1.1) | 61.0 | (1.0) | 46.6 | (2.3) | 48.1 | (1.2) | 58.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 84.5 | (1.8) | 87.3 | (1.3) | 91.0 | (1.1) | 89.5 | (1.1) | 84.0 | (2.3) | 88.8 | (0.9) | 89.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Denmark | 72.4 | (1.2) | 78.4 | (1.2) | 80.0 | (1.1) | 85.2 | (1.1) | 73.1 | (1.5) | 78.3 | (0.9) | 85.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Finland | 51.4 | (1.3) | 61.2 | (1.7) | 66.3 | (1.4) | 72.1 | (1.6) | 47.6 | (3.1) | 62.4 | (1.3) | 78.2 | (1.8) |
|  | France | 87.4 | (1.1) | 90.6 | (0.8) | 94.6 | (0.7) | 95.2 | (0.7) | 83.9 | (1.3) | 93.2 | (0.7) | 96.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Germany | 79.1 | (1.6) | 84.4 | (1.2) | 88.1 | (1.0) | 91.2 | (1.0) | 75.8 | (1.7) | 86.7 | (0.9) | 92.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 59.9 | (1.9) | 67.1 | (1.6) | 70.3 | (1.5) | 74.8 | (1.5) | 61.8 | (2.6) | 68.3 | (1.5) | 73.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Hungary | 94.8 | (0.8) | 95.8 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.6) | 96.3 | (0.7) | 94.2 | (0.7) | 95.4 | (0.6) | 96.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 90.2 | (1.0) | 95.4 | (0.6) | 96.7 | (0.7) | 96.6 | (0.6) | 93.3 | (1.0) | 94.1 | (0.5) | 96.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Ireland | 34.2 | (1.5) | 40.1 | (1.7) | 44.4 | (1.5) | 52.3 | (1.5) | 41.2 | (2.1) | 38.5 | (1.1) | 53.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Italy | 84.2 | (0.7) | 87.5 | (0.6) | 89.4 | (0.4) | 89.9 | (0.6) | 84.0 | (0.8) | 87.8 | (0.5) | 91.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 95.8 | (0.5) | 97.2 | (0.5) | 97.1 | (0.4) | 97.7 | (0.3) | 94.9 | (0.6) | 97.5 | (0.3) | 98.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 79.8 | (1.4) | 80.6 | (1.4) | 85.2 | (1.1) | 85.7 | (1.4) | 82.1 | (1.8) | 82.4 | (1.3) | 84.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 74.7 | (1.3) | 83.2 | (1.1) | 87.2 | (0.9) | 85.1 | (1.0) | 78.4 | (0.8) | 87.9 | (1.1) | 85.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | 61.3 | (1.1) | 68.6 | (0.8) | 74.2 | (0.7) | 83.3 | (0.5) | 64.4 | (1.2) | 71.3 | (0.7) | 80.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 92.7 | (1.0) | 96.3 | (0.6) | 95.2 | (0.7) | 95.9 | (0.6) | 93.3 | (1.0) | 95.5 | (0.4) | 95.6 | (0.7) |
|  | New Zealand | 60.2 | (1.9) | 70.9 | (1.6) | 74.5 | (1.6) | 80.6 | (1.4) | 61.9 | (2.7) | 71.6 | (1.3) | 78.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Norway | 78.0 | (1.2) | 85.0 | (1.2) | 88.1 | (0.9) | 94.5 | (0.7) | 79.0 | (1.9) | 85.5 | (0.7) | 93.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Poland | 28.4 | (2.2) | 42.7 | (2.1) | 56.7 | (1.8) | 76.6 | (1.6) | 31.9 | (3.2) | 50.7 | (2.2) | 75.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Portugal | 52.4 | (1.5) | 60.3 | (1.7) | 65.6 | (1.7) | 78.9 | (1.3) | 59.5 | (1.8) | 62.6 | (1.6) | 75.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 63.8 | (2.3) | 81.0 | (1.5) | 85.5 | (1.2) | 89.7 | (0.9) | 63.6 | (2.6) | 84.2 | (1.0) | 89.4 | (1.5) |
|  | Spain | 80.1 | (0.9) | 84.1 | (1.0) | 87.8 | (0.7) | 91.3 | (0.5) | 82.7 | (1.1) | 85.6 | (0.6) | 89.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Sweden | 61.9 | (1.5) | 70.6 | (1.4) | 76.3 | (1.4) | 77.2 | (1.1) | 70.5 | (2.4) | 68.3 | (1.1) | 80.5 | (1.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 68.2 | (2.3) | 71.7 | (1.9) | 77.0 | (2.1) | 75.7 | (2.6) | 63.2 | (4.3) | 76.1 | (1.9) | 77.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Turkey | 1.7 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.6) | 6.7 | (0.9) | 22.9 | (1.7) | 4.8 | (0.7) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 19.2 | (1.9) |
|  | United States | 61.2 | (1.9) | 72.1 | (1.4) | 79.7 | (1.3) | 85.4 | (1.1) | 63.9 | (1.6) | 75.6 | (1.2) | 82.8 | (1.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 67.4 | (0.3) | 73.5 | (0.2) | 77.4 | (0.2) | 81.9 | (0.2) | 68.7 | (0.4) | 75.0 | (0.2) | 81.8 | (0.3) |
| \% | Brazil | 36.7 | (1.1) | 44.7 | (1.0) | 49.1 | (1.3) | 60.5 | (1.6) | 38.8 | (1.3) | 46.8 | (1.1) | 61.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 91.2 | (0.9) | 95.7 | (0.7) | 96.4 | (0.6) | 97.2 | (0.5) | 92.2 | (0.9) | 95.7 | (0.5) | 98.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 13.7 | (1.6) | 15.4 | (1.9) | 24.3 | (1.9) | 36.7 | (3.0) | 16.7 | (2.3) | 20.0 | (2.6) | 33.8 | (4.0) |
|  | Latvia | 60.7 | (2.3) | 75.5 | (1.5) | 81.4 | (1.3) | 83.2 | (1.3) | 58.5 | (3.5) | 77.2 | (1.4) | 83.3 | (1.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 90.9 | (3.6) | 93.2 | (2.3) | 94.6 | (2.7) | 83.8 | (5.0) | c | c | 88.9 | (2.8) | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 83.7 | (1.0) | 86.2 | (0.8) | 86.6 | (0.8) | 86.3 | (1.0) | 84.9 | (0.7) | 85.6 | (1.0) | 86.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Russian Federation | 56.0 | (2.2) | 70.1 | (2.0) | 77.3 | (1.3) | 80.9 | (1.6) | 54.5 | (3.9) | 72.0 | (2.5) | 82.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Thailand | 84.0 | (1.1) | 86.3 | (1.2) | 87.9 | (1.0) | 93.2 | (0.7) | 84.3 | (1.3) | 87.3 | (0.9) | 93.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 10.9 | (1.1) | 21.3 | (1.8) | 28.2 | (1.5) | 32.3 | (1.8) | 12.8 | (1.3) | 23.8 | (1.5) | 33.2 | (1.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 57.5 | (1.8) | 65.0 | (1.9) | 70.6 | (1.4) | 85.1 | (1.1) | 60.5 | (1.6) | 68.6 | (1.7) | 87.5 | (1.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town ( $\mathbf{3} 000$ to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 48.6 | (0.8) | 56.7 | (1.1) | 54.0 | (0.7) | 42.0 | (1.3) | 46.4 | (2.2) | 49.5 | (1.3) | 53.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Austria | 87.3 | (0.8) | 92.1 | (2.2) | 79.3 | (4.9) | 88.2 | (0.7) | 85.1 | (3.0) | 88.1 | (1.0) | 87.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Belgium | 90.0 | (1.0) | 94.3 | (0.4) | 74.5 | (1.9) | 95.0 | (0.3) | 88.3 | (5.2) | 93.7 | (0.4) | 91.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Canada | 50.4 | (0.7) | 52.1 | (2.7) | 37.3 | (1.3) | 52.7 | (0.7) | 47.3 | (2.4) | 43.6 | (1.4) | 55.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | 87.8 | (1.0) | 85.9 | (2.5) | 87.5 | (1.3) | 88.6 | (0.8) | 88.1 | (4.6) | 87.8 | (1.1) | 87.3 | (1.8) |
|  | Denmark | 77.8 | (0.7) | 82.4 | (1.3) | 78.8 | (0.6) | 89.6 | (5.1) | 77.7 | (1.4) | 79.5 | (0.9) | 78.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Finland | 62.0 | (1.1) | 81.1 | (3.9) | 62.7 | (1.0) | c | c | 49.1 | (6.5) | 58.0 | (1.2) | 77.3 | (1.2) |
|  | France | 91.7 | (0.6) | 91.2 | (0.9) | 83.1 | (1.3) | 95.4 | (0.4) | 87.8 | (2.0) | 92.3 | (0.7) | 91.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Germany | 84.8 | (0.8) | 89.2 | (3.5) | 85.2 | (0.6) | 84.2 | (5.8) | c | c | 85.2 | (0.9) | 85.0 | (1.6) |
|  | Greece | 68.3 | (1.0) | c | c | 42.4 | (3.9) | 69.5 | (1.0) | 69.6 | (4.3) | 67.8 | (1.3) | 67.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Hungary | 95.6 | (0.4) | 95.7 | (1.1) | 90.2 | (1.6) | 96.2 | (0.3) | 95.4 | (2.3) | 96.2 | (0.5) | 94.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 94.7 | (0.4) | c | c | 94.7 | (0.4) | c | c | 92.4 | (0.9) | 96.5 | (0.5) | 93.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Ireland | 40.8 | (1.3) | 43.1 | (1.3) | 48.0 | (1.1) | 34.2 | (1.3) | 38.4 | (2.0) | 40.5 | (1.2) | 50.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Italy | 87.8 | (0.3) | 86.1 | (1.6) | 56.7 | (3.9) | 88.4 | (0.3) | 85.0 | (2.6) | 89.0 | (0.4) | 85.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Japan | 96.7 | (0.3) | 97.4 | (0.3) | c | c | 96.9 | (0.2) | c | c | 96.4 | (0.5) | 97.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 82.5 | (1.2) | 83.2 | (1.4) | 78.2 | (5.2) | 83.2 | (0.9) | c | c | 81.2 | (3.9) | 83.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 83.2 | (0.6) | 79.1 | (1.5) | 80.2 | (0.7) | 86.1 | (0.7) | c | c | 82.6 | (0.5) | c | c |
|  | Mexico | 70.4 | (0.6) | 82.2 | (0.9) | 67.6 | (0.9) | 74.3 | (0.7) | 66.0 | (1.4) | 70.6 | (1.1) | 75.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 94.8 | (0.7) | 94.7 | (0.4) | 94.7 | (0.4) | 95.8 | (0.7) | c | c | 95.1 | (0.4) | 93.9 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 71.3 | (0.9) | 79.4 | (2.3) | 57.4 | (3.4) | 72.1 | (0.8) | 67.0 | (3.5) | 73.8 | (1.6) | 70.1 | (1.4) |
|  | Norway | 86.4 | (0.6) | c | c | 86.3 | (0.6) | c | c | 83.1 | (1.6) | 87.0 | (0.8) | 86.7 | (1.6) |
|  | Poland | 50.4 | (1.6) | 76.5 | (3.5) | 51.0 | (1.5) | c | c | 32.4 | (3.0) | 54.4 | (2.1) | 72.9 | (2.5) |
|  | Portugal | 62.8 | (1.0) | 78.1 | (3.7) | 57.6 | (1.4) | 69.7 | (1.3) | 58.9 | (5.9) | 64.4 | (1.2) | 65.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 79.9 | (1.1) | 81.0 | (5.1) | 75.7 | (2.0) | 83.5 | (1.2) | 66.7 | (4.0) | 80.8 | (1.2) | 88.9 | (1.6) |
|  | Spain | 83.9 | (0.6) | 89.9 | (0.6) | 85.8 | (0.4) | c | c | 90.4 | (1.1) | 85.4 | (0.6) | 86.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Sweden | 70.8 | (0.9) | 75.2 | (2.4) | 71.9 | (0.9) | 49.2 | (5.7) | 71.5 | (1.6) | 70.9 | (1.3) | 72.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 71.8 | (2.0) | 86.3 | (2.4) | 74.3 | (2.0) | 69.4 | (4.1) | 69.7 | (7.4) | 70.9 | (2.4) | 81.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Turkey | 8.2 | (0.7) | c | c | 3.8 | (2.3) | 8.8 | (0.8) | 10.7 | (4.5) | 8.0 | (1.3) | 9.0 | (1.0) |
|  | United States | 74.2 | (1.0) | 84.1 | (2.9) | 69.2 | (2.5) | 75.3 | (0.9) | 72.6 | (3.5) | 76.6 | (1.3) | 73.3 | (1.3) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 73.7 | (0.2) | 81.1 | (0.5) | 68.9 | (0.4) | 74.5 | (0.5) | 67.5 | (0.8) | 74.1 | (0.3) | 76.5 | (0.3) |
| 5 | Brazil | 44.1 | (0.7) | 63.9 | (2.5) | 37.2 | (1.5) | 50.4 | (0.9) | 43.4 | (7.3) | 42.4 | (0.9) | 53.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 96.1 | (1.5) | 95.1 | (0.5) | 90.6 | (0.9) | 97.3 | (0.3) | c | c | c | c | 95.1 | (0.4) |
|  | Indonesia | 21.5 | (1.8) | 24.3 | (2.8) | 22.5 | (2.2) | 22.5 | (2.3) | 19.1 | (3.7) | 21.2 | (2.1) | 30.5 | (4.9) |
|  | Latvia | 75.3 | (1.0) | c | c | 76.1 | (1.0) | 56.6 | (4.5) | 59.9 | (3.2) | 80.7 | (1.0) | 80.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 90.4 | (1.8) | c | c | 90.0 | (2.1) | c | c | c | c | 90.5 | (1.9) | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | c | c | 85.6 | (0.4) | 82.4 | (0.7) | 89.5 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | 85.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | 71.0 | (1.4) | c | c | 72.5 | (1.4) | 63.7 | (2.4) | 50.5 | (3.1) | 71.0 | (2.6) | 80.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Thailand | 87.9 | (0.7) | 87.0 | (1.3) | 82.5 | (1.6) | 89.2 | (0.6) | 84.2 | (2.3) | 87.1 | (0.9) | 90.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Tunisia | 23.2 | (1.0) | c | c | 17.5 | (1.4) | 26.4 | (1.2) | 18.5 | (3.6) | 21.6 | (1.2) | 28.5 | (2.0) |
|  | Uruguay | 65.6 | (1.1) | 89.3 | (1.4) | 58.0 | (1.7) | 77.6 | (1.0) | 61.3 | (6.1) | 65.2 | (1.5) | 78.1 | (1.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.
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|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom quarter of ESCS |  | Second quarterof ESCS |  | Third quarter of ESCS |  | Top quarter of ESCS |  | Difference between top and bottom quarters of ESCS (top - bottom) |  | Socioeconomically disadvantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Socio- <br> economically <br> average <br> schools |  | Socioeconomically advantaged schools ${ }^{1}$ |  | Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged schools (advantaged disadvantaged) |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dif. in } \\ & \text { \% dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dif. in } \\ & \% \text { dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 5.0 | (1.7) | 6.5 | (1.6) | 6.9 | (1.6) | 6.0 | (1.5) | 1.0 | (2.3) | 3.4 | (1.8) | 5.5 | (1.5) | 8.9 | (1.7) | 5.5 | (2.4) |
|  | Austria | 14.7 | (2.8) | 7.5 | (2.2) | 4.5 | (1.8) | 3.6 | (1.6) | -11.1 | (3.6) | 8.8 | (2.6) | 8.0 | (2.0) | 4.4 | (1.7) | -4.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Belgium | -0.9 | (1.3) | -0.4 | (1.0) | -0.6 | (0.6) | -0.6 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (1.3) | -3.0 | (1.2) | -0.2 | (0.8) | -0.1 | (0.6) | 2.9 | (1.4) |
|  | Canada | 7.1 | (1.6) | 6.3 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (1.6) | 3.5 | (1.7) | -3.6 | (2.1) | 13.8 | (2.9) | 1.4 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (2.3) | -11.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 9.8 | (2.4) | 9.6 | (1.7) | 10.1 | (1.6) | 7.5 | (1.6) | -2.3 | (3.1) | 9.4 | (2.9) | 8.4 | (1.4) | 9.8 | (1.7) | 0.4 | (3.6) |
|  | Denmark | 14.5 | (2.2) | 10.7 | (2.2) | 14.0 | (1.9) | 14.0 | (2.0) | -0.5 | (2.8) | 10.7 | (3.2) | 13.8 | (1.5) | 12.8 | (2.2) | 2.1 | (4.0) |
|  | Finland | -6.7 | (2.1) | -4.1 | (2.2) | -3.4 | (2.0) | -1.8 | (2.2) | 4.8 | (2.6) | -7.9 | (3.9) | -4.5 | (1.7) | -0.7 | (2.6) | 7.2 | (4.8) |
|  | France | -3.7 | (1.4) | -2.7 | (1.2) | 0.5 | (1.0) | -1.8 | (1.0) | 1.9 | (1.8) | -6.6 | (1.7) | -1.3 | (0.9) | -0.3 | (0.8) | 6.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Germany | 7.7 | (2.1) | 2.1 | (1.8) | 1.8 | (1.6) | 0.9 | (1.4) | -6.9 | (2.7) | 2.3 | (2.1) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 0.7 | (1.3) | -1.5 | (2.7) |
|  | Greece | 1.2 | (3.0) | 7.6 | (2.6) | 8.3 | (2.2) | 7.2 | (2.5) | 6.0 | (3.6) | 3.2 | (3.6) | 7.3 | (2.7) | 7.0 | (3.0) | 3.8 | (4.5) |
|  | Hungary | 2.9 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (1.0) | -0.8 | (0.9) | -3.7 | (1.5) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 0.5 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (0.8) | -0.8 | (1.3) |
|  | Iceland | 8.1 | (1.6) | 6.9 | (1.3) | 5.7 | (1.1) | 2.7 | (1.1) | -5.3 | (1.9) | 11.4 | (2.0) | 4.6 | (0.9) | 4.8 | (1.0) | -6.6 | (2.1) |
|  | Ireland | 8.7 | (2.4) | 9.4 | (2.4) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 13.8 | (2.7) | 5.1 | (3.1) | 12.4 | (3.3) | 9.1 | (1.8) | 9.0 | (3.1) | -3.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Italy | -0.2 | (1.4) | -0.1 | (1.1) | 3.4 | (1.2) | 0.9 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (1.7) | -0.9 | (1.0) | 2.2 | (0.9) | 0.9 | (2.0) |
|  | Japan | -0.8 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.7) | -0.4 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 1.3 | (0.9) | -1.0 | (0.8) | 0.3 | (0.6) | 0.0 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Korea | 0.0 | (1.8) | -5.9 | (1.8) | -4.2 | (1.4) | -4.6 | (1.7) | -4.6 | (2.3) | -0.2 | (2.2) | -5.5 | (1.6) | -5.1 | (1.6) | -4.9 | (2.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | -1.0 | (1.9) | 4.0 | (1.8) | 6.1 | (1.5) | 4.1 | (1.6) | 5.1 | (2.4) | 1.1 | (1.2) | c | c | 3.7 | (1.3) | 2.7 | (1.6) |
|  | Mexico | 11.8 | (2.1) | 9.2 | (1.7) | 2.1 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (1.3) | -10.5 | (2.7) | 11.4 | (2.4) | 3.4 | (1.5) | 1.2 | (1.6) | -10.2 | (3.1) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.7 | (1.4) | 2.7 | (1.1) | 1.5 | (1.1) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 1.6 | (1.6) | 0.8 | (1.4) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (1.1) | 0.3 | (1.8) |
|  | New Zealand | -3.6 | (2.3) | 3.0 | (2.2) | -0.6 | (2.2) | 0.7 | (2.0) | 4.3 | (3.1) | -4.2 | (3.1) | 0.3 | (1.7) | 1.4 | (2.3) | 5.6 | (4.5) |
|  | Norway | 9.7 | (2.1) | 7.2 | (2.1) | 7.3 | (1.5) | 8.2 | (1.7) | -1.6 | (2.5) | 3.5 | (3.7) | 8.1 | (1.4) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 4.4 | (4.0) |
|  | Poland | -0.9 | (2.9) | 6.0 | (2.8) | 9.4 | (2.6) | 12.4 | (2.2) | 13.3 | (3.7) | -0.6 | (4.4) | 6.7 | (2.6) | 15.5 | (2.5) | 16.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Portugal | 7.1 | (2.5) | 11.7 | (2.5) | 10.9 | (2.3) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 0.6 | (2.8) | 9.1 | (2.9) | 8.3 | (2.5) | 13.8 | (3.0) | 4.7 | (4.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -3.9 | (3.1) | 2.4 | (1.8) | 6.0 | (1.6) | 10.5 | (1.7) | 14.3 | (2.9) | -8.9 | (3.3) | 8.0 | (1.6) | 9.4 | (1.8) | 18.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Spain | 0.2 | (1.9) | 1.9 | (1.4) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (2.5) | 1.4 | (2.0) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (1.1) | -0.8 | (2.5) |
|  | Sweden | 10.9 | (2.4) | 14.6 | (2.2) | 12.4 | (2.2) | 10.1 | (2.0) | -0.8 | (2.9) | 17.4 | (3.4) | 9.7 | (1.6) | 12.3 | (3.1) | -5.1 | (4.8) |
|  | Switzerland | 4.9 | (3.4) | 5.2 | (3.0) | 11.0 | (3.0) | 4.8 | (3.6) | -0.1 | (3.9) | 4.6 | (5.7) | 6.7 | (2.8) | 7.4 | (5.4) | 2.9 | (7.3) |
|  | Turkey | 0.8 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.9) | 1.3 | (1.1) | 0.8 | (2.2) | 0.0 | (2.4) | 2.3 | (0.8) | -0.1 | (0.9) | 1.0 | (2.3) | -1.2 | (2.6) |
|  | United States | 49.7 | (2.1) | 62.0 | (1.7) | 70.1 | (1.5) | 75.3 | (1.3) | 25.6 | (2.6) | 52.0 | (1.9) | 65.9 | (1.4) | 72.7 | (1.6) | 20.7 | (2.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 5.3 | (0.4) | 6.4 | (0.3) | 6.9 | (0.3) | 6.5 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.5) | 5.2 | (0.5) | 6.1 | (0.3) | 7.1 | (0.4) | 1.9 | (0.7) |
| 茲 | Brazil | 5.4 | (2.2) | 4.9 | (1.9) | 0.4 | (2.0) | 0.8 | (2.5) | -4.6 | (3.1) | 4.4 | (2.6) | 4.7 | (1.8) | -3.0 | (2.8) | -7.5 | (3.9) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 15.2 | (1.6) | 10.1 | (2.0) | 4.2 | (1.2) | 2.7 | (0.9) | -12.5 | (1.7) | 12.1 | (2.4) | 7.0 | (1.2) | 4.5 | (1.0) | -7.6 | (2.6) |
|  | Indonesia | 1.1 | (2.2) | -6.7 | (2.4) | -3.5 | (2.5) | -2.3 | (4.3) | -3.4 | (3.9) | 3.1 | (3.1) | -6.8 | (3.7) | -3.8 | (5.3) | -6.9 | (5.4) |
|  | Latvia | 12.9 | (3.0) | 18.4 | (2.6) | 20.3 | (2.1) | 26.4 | (2.3) | 13.5 | (3.7) | 17.5 | (4.9) | 20.7 | (2.0) | 19.8 | (2.3) | 2.3 | (5.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 11.6 | (5.5) | -4.4 | (2.8) | 1.9 | (4.0) | -8.9 | (5.8) | -20.5 | (8.3) | c | c | -3.6 | (3.3) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | 8.3 | (3.5) | 6.8 | (3.0) | 3.2 | (2.8) | 4.6 | (2.7) | -3.7 | (4.5) | 11.3 | (2.8) | 1.6 | (2.2) | 2.2 | (2.5) | -9.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | -16.0 | (3.1) | -9.3 | (2.6) | -5.0 | (1.9) | 0.9 | (2.1) | 16.9 | (3.3) | -18.3 | (4.6) | -8.3 | (2.8) | 0.8 | (1.9) | 19.1 | (4.8) |
|  | Thailand | 20.5 | (2.7) | 17.2 | (2.0) | 11.6 | (1.9) | 5.0 | (1.2) | -15.5 | (2.9) | 17.8 | (2.6) | 15.2 | (2.0) | 4.8 | (1.3) | -13.0 | (2.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 3.1 | (1.4) | 4.0 | (2.2) | -4.7 | (2.2) | -16.5 | (2.9) | -19.6 | (2.9) | 1.3 | (1.8) | -3.2 | (2.1) | -13.8 | (3.2) | -15.1 | (3.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 13.7 | (2.7) | 4.8 | (2.9) | 1.5 | (1.9) | 4.3 | (1.6) | -9.4 | (2.8) | 12.9 | (2.4) | 3.6 | (2.6) | 8.8 | (2.1) | -4.2 | (3.6) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

[Part 6/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in years in pre-school, by school features
Table IV.3.51 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) for more than one year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Difference between private and public schools (priv. - pub.) |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | DifferencebetweenISCED 3 andISCED 2ISCD 3-ISCED 2) |  | Schools located in a village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3000 people) |  | Schools located in a small town or town (3000 to about 100000 people) |  | Schools located in a city or a large city (over 100000 people) |  | Differencebetween ruralarea andtown(town - rural) |  | Difference between town and a city (town - city) |  |
|  |  | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dif. in } \\ & \text { \% dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dif. in } \\ & \% \text { dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dif. in } \\ & \text { \% dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | Dif. in \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | c | c | c | c | c | c | 6.8 | (1.0) | 2.2 | (1.9) | -4.6 | (2.0) | 5.2 | (4.3) | 5.8 | (1.8) | 6.0 | (1.3) | 0.6 | (4.6) | -0.2 | (2.5) |
|  | Austria | 7.7 | (1.4) | 5.8 | (3.7) | -1.8 | (4.0) | 8.3 | (6.0) | 7.6 | (1.4) | -0.6 | (5.4) | 9.0 | (4.4) | 7.1 | (1.9) | 8.3 | (2.2) | -1.9 | (5.0) | -1.2 | (2.7) |
|  | Belgium | -1.8 | (1.3) | -0.7 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (1.5) | 4.1 | (3.7) | 0.5 | (0.4) | -3.6 | (3.6) | -2.2 | (5.8) | -0.9 | (0.6) | -0.7 | (1.5) | 1.2 | (4.8) | -0.3 | (1.7) |
|  | Canada | 5.4 | (1.0) | 4.0 | (4.0) | -1.4 | (4.1) | 5.3 | (1.8) | 4.3 | (1.1) | -1.0 | (2.1) | 6.4 | (3.4) | 1.6 | (1.9) | 5.1 | (1.6) | -4.8 | (3.9) | -3.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 9.0 | (1.2) | 7.2 | (4.4) | -1.8 | (4.2) | 8.3 | (1.8) | 10.1 | (1.2) | 1.8 | (2.1) | 7.7 | (5.5) | 8.6 | (1.4) | 10.3 | (2.4) | 0.9 | (5.5) | -1.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Denmark | 11.9 | (1.4) | 16.5 | (2.4) | 4.6 | (3.1) | 13.0 | (1.2) | 31.6 | (7.4) | 18.7 | (7.5) | 17.0 | (2.8) | 13.0 | (1.7) | 8.1 | (2.9) | -4.1 | (3.6) | 4.9 | (3.5) |
|  | Finland | -4.2 | (1.4) | 6.6 | (5.2) | 10.8 | (5.4) | -4.1 | (1.4) | c | c | c | c | -4.2 | (7.1) | -7.9 | (1.6) | 0.4 | (2.0) | -3.7 | (7.1) | -8.3 | (2.6) |
|  | France | c | c | c | c | c | c | -6.7 | (1.6) | -1.1 | (0.5) | 5.6 | (1.5) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Germany | 2.7 | (1.1) | 0.2 | (4.4) | -2.6 | (4.2) | 2.5 | (0.9) | 8.6 | (6.8) | 6.1 | (6.7) | c | c | 1.8 | (1.3) | 4.2 | (2.3) | c | c | -2.4 | (2.5) |
|  | Greece | 6.6 | (1.8) | c | c | c | c | -5.1 | (4.8) | 6.1 | (1.8) | 11.2 | (5.3) | 13.8 | (7.8) | 5.0 | (2.1) | 7.3 | (3.7) | -8.8 | (8.4) | -2.3 | (4.4) |
|  | Hungary | 1.3 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (1.5) | 0.8 | (1.6) | 2.5 | (2.6) | 1.5 | (0.5) | -0.9 | (2.8) | 6.6 | (4.0) | 1.9 | (0.8) | 0.2 | (0.8) | -4.7 | (4.6) | 1.6 | (1.1) |
|  | Iceland | 5.9 | (0.7) | c | c | c | c | 5.8 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | 11.0 | (1.6) | 5.7 | (0.8) | 0.8 | (1.4) | -5.3 | (1.7) | 4.9 | (1.6) |
|  | Ireland | 12.1 | (2.2) | 8.9 | (2.1) | -3.2 | (3.2) | 12.9 | (1.8) | 6.3 | (2.0) | -6.7 | (2.3) | 16.2 | (2.8) | 10.3 | (1.9) | 6.8 | (2.8) | -5.9 | (3.2) | 3.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Italy | 1.1 | (0.8) | -3.8 | (2.5) | -4.9 | (2.5) | 1.6 | (9.2) | 1.1 | (0.7) | -0.5 | (9.8) | -5.4 | (7.3) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (1.3) | 6.8 | (7.1) | 0.9 | (1.6) |
|  | Japan | -0.2 | (0.5) | -0.3 | (0.5) | -0.1 | (0.8) | c |  | -0.2 | (0.4) | c | c | c | c | 0.2 | (0.7) | -0.4 | (0.4) | c | c | 0.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Korea | -3.1 | (1.6) | -4.0 | (1.5) | -0.9 | (2.2) | -8.3 | (6.9) | -3.4 | (1.1) | 4.9 | (7.1) | c | c | -0.6 | (4.5) | -4.6 | (1.0) | c | c | 4.0 | (4.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.8 | (1.0) | -5.7 | (2.1) | -10.4 | (2.3) | 1.2 | (1.1) | 6.1 | (1.4) | 4.9 | (1.9) | c | c | 3.3 | (0.9) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Mexico | 7.1 | (1.4) | 4.8 | (2.4) | -2.3 | (2.8) | 5.1 | (2.4) | 4.3 | (1.1) | -0.8 | (2.7) | 14.3 | (3.4) | 3.6 | (1.7) | 2.3 | (1.6) | -10.6 | (3.8) | 1.3 | (2.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 3.0 | (1.4) | 0.3 | (0.6) | -2.7 | (1.7) | 1.2 | (0.6) | 0.6 | (1.0) | -0.6 | (1.1) | c | c | 0.8 | (0.7) | 0.9 | (1.2) | c | c | -0.1 | (1.3) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.7 | (1.2) | 4.5 | (5.9) | 5.3 | (5.9) | -13.1 | (4.2) | 0.4 | (1.1) | 13.5 | (4.5) | -2.4 | (4.7) | 0.9 | (2.0) | -0.6 | (1.9) | 3.3 | (5.5) | 1.5 | (2.8) |
|  | Norway | 7.9 | (1.2) | c | c | c | c | 7.9 | (1.2) | c | c | c | c | 6.1 | (2.5) | 9.3 | (1.6) | 3.8 | (2.8) | 3.2 | (2.7) | 5.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Poland | 6.3 | (2.0) | c |  | c | c | 6.5 | (2.0) | c | c | c | c | -3.0 | (4.0) | 10.8 | (2.6) | 12.8 | (3.0) | 13.8 | (4.7) | -2.1 | (3.7) |
|  | Portugal | 8.3 | (1.7) | 17.2 | (5.6) | 8.9 | (6.4) | 5.5 | (2.4) | 13.3 | (2.1) | 7.8 | (3.1) | 4.7 | (7.0) | 10.1 | (2.0) | 8.4 | (4.3) | 5.4 | (7.0) | 1.7 | (5.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 3.7 | (1.5) | 4.7 | (5.5) | 1.0 | (5.8) | 1.2 | (2.5) | 6.3 | (1.5) | 5.0 | (2.8) | -4.6 | (5.2) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 10.9 | (2.2) | 8.8 | (4.5) | -6.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Spain | 1.5 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (0.9) | 0.6 | (1.5) | 1.5 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | 4.9 | (3.1) | 0.9 | (1.0) | 1.6 | (1.6) | -4.0 | (3.4) | -0.7 | (2.0) |
|  | Sweden | 11.3 | (1.5) | 14.2 | (3.0) | 2.9 | (3.2) | 12.2 | (1.4) | -6.7 | (10.2) | -18.9 | (10.6) | 13.5 | (2.8) | 12.3 | (1.9) | 8.9 | (2.5) | -1.2 | (3.2) | 3.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 5.7 | (2.8) | 15.6 | (6.9) | 9.9 | (7.3) | 8.7 | (2.8) | -2.9 | (5.1) | -11.6 | (6.2) | 8.7 | (9.0) | 5.6 | (3.4) | 3.0 | (3.7) | -3.2 | (10.8) | 2.6 | (5.5) |
|  | Turkey |  | (1.0) | c |  | c | c | 1.7 | (2.7) | 0.6 | (1.1) | -1.0 | (3.2) | c | c | 2.4 | (1.5) | -0.7 | (1.4) | c | c | 3.1 | (2.2) |
|  | United States | 64.3 | (1.1) | 76.9 | (3.4) | 12.7 | (4.5) | 55.5 | (2.8) | 66.7 | (1.1) | 11.2 | (2.9) | 64.1 | (3.8) | 66.7 | (1.5) | 63.4 | (1.6) | 2.5 | (4.1) | 3.2 | (2.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 6.6 | (0.3) | 8.1 | (0.8) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 5.1 | (0.6) | 6.8 | (0.7) | 1.7 | (1.0) | 8.5 | (1.1) | 6.6 | (0.3) | 6.2 | (0.4) | -0.5 | (1.1) | 0.5 | (0.6) |


| : | Brazil | 1.8 | (1.7) | 3.2 | (3.4) | 1.5 | (3.9) | 3.0 | (2.3) | -1.1 | (1.7) | -4.0 | (2.9) |  | (10.2) | 0.3 | (2.0) | 3.3 | (2.1) | -6.7 | 10.2) | -3.0 | (3.0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 6.7 | (1.9) | 8.2 | (1.1) | 1.5 | (2.6) | 15.4 | (2.1) | 1.8 | (0.5) | -13.7 | (2.1) | C | c | C | c | 8.0 | (1.0) | C | c | C | C |
|  | Indonesia | -3.8 | (2.4) | -1.4 | (3.7) | 2.4 | (4.2) | -0.4 | (2.7) | -7.4 | (3.2) | -7.0 | (3.6) | -3.7 | (5.1) | -3.5 | (3.9) | 0.9 | (5.6) | 0.2 | (7.1) | -4.4 | (7.2) |
|  | Latvia | 19.7 | (1.5) | C | c | C | c | 20.7 | (1.5) | -3.5 | (5.4) | -24.2 | (5.7) | 20.7 | (4.2) | 20.4 | (2.1) | 15.2 | (2.0) | -0.3 | (4.7) | 5.2 | (2.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 | (2.4) | C | c | c | c | -0.7 | (2.6) | C | c | C | c | c | c | -0.1 | (2.4) | C | C | C | c | C | c |
|  | Macao-China | c | c | 5.5 | (1.5) | c | c | 5.4 | (1.8) | 0.9 | (2.5) | -4.5 | (3.1) | c | c | C | c | 5.7 | (1.4) | C | c | C | C |
|  | Russian Federation | -7.3 | (1.9) | C | c | C | c | -1.3 | (2.4) | -16.9 | (2.6) | -15.6 | (2.8) | -16.7 | (4.7) | -7.8 | (3.0) | -1.5 | (1.6) | 8.9 | (5.1) | -6.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Thailand | 14.0 | (1.4) | 10.1 | (3.2) | -3.8 | (3.5) | 9.7 | (2.3) | 13.6 | (1.3) | 3.9 | (2.3) | 15.2 | (3.4) | 15.5 | (2.2) | 6.4 | (1.8) | 0.2 | (4.3) | 9.1 | (3.0) |
|  | Tunisia | c | c | C | C | c | C | -2.3 | (1.8) | -12.1 | (2.6) | -9.8 | (2.7) | 1.4 | (7.2) | -3.1 | (1.9) | -12.0 | (4.4) | -4.5 | (7.7) | 8.9 | (5.5) |
|  | Uruguay | 5.5 | (1.7) | 4.2 | (1.9) | -1.3 | (2.8) | 6.2 | (2.1) | 8.2 | (1.7) | 2.0 | (2.6) | 16.5 | (8.6) | 6.7 | (2.2) | 5.1 | (2.1) | -9.8 | (9.0) | 1.6 | (3.2) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

1. A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

[Part 1/2]
Index of school responsibility for resource allocation and mathematics performance
Table IV.4.1 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of school responsibility for resource allocation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 0.06 | (0.03) | -0.61 | (0.01) | -0.43 | (0.01) | -0.15 | (0.02) | 1.44 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Austria | -0.56 | (0.03) | -0.72 | (0.01) | -0.67 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.01) | -0.26 | (0.12) | 0.37 | (0.14) |
| Belgium | -0.29 | (0.01) | -0.67 | (0.02) | -0.40 | (0.02) | -0.10 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.29 | (0.02) |
| Canada | -0.35 | (0.03) | -0.67 | (0.01) | -0.55 | (0.00) | -0.45 | (0.01) | 0.26 | (0.10) | 0.61 | (0.06) |
| Chile | 0.57 | (0.07) | -0.75 | (0.01) | -0.34 | (0.06) | 0.91 | (0.17) | 2.46 | (0.11) | 1.29 | (0.04) |
| Czech Republic | 1.22 | (0.10) | -0.36 | (0.02) | 0.28 | (0.14) | 2.26 | (0.25) | 2.71 | (0.00) | 1.36 | (0.02) |
| Denmark | 0.18 | (0.06) | -0.40 | (0.01) | -0.21 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.02) | 1.34 | (0.22) | 0.88 | (0.07) |
| Estonia | 0.14 | (0.04) | -0.34 | (0.01) | -0.13 | (0.02) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 1.05 | (0.16) | 0.75 | (0.06) |
| Finland | -0.28 | (0.02) | -0.63 | (0.01) | -0.44 | (0.02) | -0.34 | (0.01) | 0.29 | (0.07) | 0.55 | (0.04) |
| France | -0.54 | (0.01) | -0.77 | (0.01) | -0.62 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.01) | -0.25 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.06) |
| Germany | -0.58 | (0.01) | -0.74 | (0.01) | -0.65 | (0.01) | -0.56 | (0.01) | -0.38 | (0.01) | 0.14 | (0.01) |
| Greece | -0.70 | (0.01) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.71 | (0.01) | -0.53 | (0.02) | 0.16 | (0.02) |
| Hungary | 0.46 | (0.10) | -0.50 | (0.03) | -0.22 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.14) | 2.31 | (0.23) | 1.15 | (0.07) |
| Iceland | -0.04 | (0.00) | -0.42 | (0.00) | -0.24 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.00) | 0.54 | (0.02) | 0.61 | (0.01) |
| Ireland | -0.43 | (0.02) | -0.72 | (0.01) | -0.54 | (0.03) | -0.35 | (0.02) | -0.09 | (0.02) | 0.25 | (0.01) |
| Israel | -0.24 | (0.04) | -0.61 | (0.01) | -0.46 | (0.02) | -0.33 | (0.02) | 0.44 | (0.15) | 0.60 | (0.09) |
| Italy | -0.59 | (0.02) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.76 | (0.01) | -0.69 | (0.00) | -0.10 | (0.07) | 0.57 | (0.05) |
| Japan | -0.27 | (0.04) | -0.73 | (0.01) | -0.70 | (0.00) | -0.53 | (0.03) | 0.89 | (0.13) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| Korea | -0.44 | (0.05) | -0.77 | (0.01) | -0.67 | (0.02) | -0.49 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.18) | 0.58 | (0.12) |
| Luxembourg | -0.20 | (0.00) | -0.65 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.00) | -0.44 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.01) | 0.78 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | -0.31 | (0.02) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.70 | (0.01) | -0.51 | (0.01) | 0.75 | (0.08) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| Netherlands | 1.26 | (0.10) | -0.21 | (0.07) | 0.64 | (0.15) | 1.91 | (0.22) | 2.71 | (0.01) | 1.16 | (0.03) |
| New Zealand | 0.11 | (0.05) | -0.33 | (0.02) | -0.14 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.90 | (0.17) | 0.67 | (0.08) |
| Norway | -0.18 | (0.03) | -0.50 | (0.02) | -0.36 | (0.01) | -0.16 | (0.04) | 0.29 | (0.10) | 0.43 | (0.08) |
| Poland | -0.34 | (0.02) | -0.59 | (0.01) | -0.48 | (0.03) | -0.36 | (0.01) | 0.08 | (0.06) | 0.44 | (0.03) |
| Portugal | -0.48 | (0.03) | -0.78 | (0.01) | -0.65 | (0.03) | -0.51 | (0.02) | 0.03 | (0.11) | 0.50 | (0.09) |
| Slovak Republic | 0.78 | (0.09) | -0.38 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.04) | 0.83 | (0.30) | 2.71 | (0.03) | 1.25 | (0.04) |
| Slovenia | -0.11 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.00) | -0.35 | (0.00) | -0.19 | (0.00) | 0.57 | (0.06) | 0.66 | (0.03) |
| Spain | -0.42 | (0.03) | -0.78 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.01) | -0.52 | (0.02) | 0.32 | (0.11) | 0.61 | (0.08) |
| Sweden | 0.63 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.02) | -0.10 | (0.03) | 0.46 | (0.10) | 2.50 | (0.19) | 1.16 | (0.05) |
| Switzerland | -0.13 | (0.04) | -0.57 | (0.02) | -0.37 | (0.01) | -0.20 | (0.03) | 0.60 | (0.14) | 0.63 | (0.06) |
| Turkey | -0.72 | (0.01) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.74 | (0.01) | -0.59 | (0.02) | 0.09 | (0.01) |
| United Kingdom | 1.10 | (0.08) | -0.37 | (0.03) | 0.40 | (0.10) | 1.68 | (0.22) | 2.71 | (0.00) | 1.24 | (0.03) |
| United States | 0.08 | (0.06) | -0.56 | (0.02) | -0.40 | (0.02) | -0.17 | (0.12) | 1.47 | (0.15) | 0.86 | (0.05) |
| OECD average | -0.05 | (0.01) | -0.59 | (0.00) | -0.39 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.69 | (0.01) |
| \% Albania | -0.60 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.70 | (0.02) | -0.13 | (0.14) | 0.50 | (0.11) |
| Argentina | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| © Brazil | -0.32 | (0.04) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.02) | 1.02 | (0.16) | 1.02 | (0.05) |
| Bulgaria | 0.86 | (0.10) | -0.22 | (0.03) | 0.25 | (0.09) | 0.84 | (0.14) | 2.58 | (0.20) | 1.08 | (0.05) |
| Colombia | -0.36 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.76 | (0.01) | -0.64 | (0.02) | 0.75 | (0.14) | 0.92 | (0.06) |
| Costa Rica | -0.36 | (0.04) | -0.78 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.02) | -0.58 | (0.01) | 0.66 | (0.16) | 0.89 | (0.07) |
| Croatia | -0.34 | (0.03) | -0.60 | (0.02) | -0.42 | (0.02) | -0.31 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.10) |
| Cyprus* | -0.35 | (0.00) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.66 | (0.00) | 0.86 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.42 | (0.09) | -0.33 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.17 | (0.05) | 1.87 | (0.31) | 0.99 | (0.09) |
| Indonesia | 0.33 | (0.09) | -0.70 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.03) | 0.25 | (0.20) | 2.32 | (0.15) | 1.26 | (0.05) |
| Jordan | -0.51 | (0.03) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.01) | -0.63 | (0.02) | 0.14 | (0.10) | 0.65 | (0.05) |
| Kazakhstan | -0.33 | (0.04) | -0.61 | (0.01) | -0.56 | (0.00) | -0.43 | (0.03) | 0.28 | (0.17) | 0.56 | (0.12) |
| Latvia | 0.60 | (0.08) | -0.30 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.46 | (0.11) | 2.26 | (0.21) | 1.06 | (0.05) |
| Liechtenstein | -0.08 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | -0.38 | (0.01) | 1.19 | (0.06) | 0.89 | (0.02) |
| Lithuania | 0.78 | (0.08) | -0.38 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.06) | 0.89 | (0.21) | 2.62 | (0.06) | 1.20 | (0.04) |
| Macao-China | 1.64 | (0.00) | -0.25 | (0.00) | 1.41 | (0.00) | 2.68 | (0.00) | 2.71 | (0.00) | 1.25 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | -0.49 | (0.03) | -0.75 | (0.01) | -0.60 | (0.02) | -0.56 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.12) | 0.52 | (0.10) |
| Montenegro | -0.33 | (0.00) | -0.58 | (0.00) | -0.47 | (0.00) | -0.36 | (0.00) | 0.07 | (0.00) | 0.50 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 0.18 | (0.07) | -0.78 | (0.01) | -0.61 | (0.02) | -0.41 | (0.07) | 2.50 | (0.22) | 1.38 | (0.04) |
| Qatar | -0.37 | (0.00) | -0.68 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.00) | -0.36 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.00) | 0.36 | (0.00) |
| Romania | -0.57 | (0.02) | -0.79 | (0.01) | -0.70 | (0.02) | -0.57 | (0.02) | -0.23 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.06) |
| Russian Federation | 0.03 | (0.07) | -0.52 | (0.02) | -0.34 | (0.03) | -0.07 | (0.04) | 1.04 | (0.22) | 0.77 | (0.08) |
| Serbia | -0.39 | (0.02) | -0.64 | (0.02) | -0.50 | (0.02) | -0.37 | (0.01) | -0.07 | (0.06) | 0.30 | (0.06) |
| Shanghai-China | -0.28 | (0.05) | -0.75 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.03) | -0.37 | (0.03) | 0.56 | (0.18) | 0.67 | (0.10) |
| Singapore | -0.36 | (0.01) | -0.70 | (0.00) | -0.57 | (0.00) | -0.46 | (0.00) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 0.69 | (0.03) |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.07 | (0.06) | -0.64 | (0.02) | -0.39 | (0.02) | -0.18 | (0.04) | 1.50 | (0.20) | 1.01 | (0.06) |
| Thailand | 0.70 | (0.08) | -0.47 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.06) | 0.74 | (0.17) | 2.59 | (0.11) | 1.20 | (0.04) |
| Tunisia | -0.20 | (0.06) | -0.75 | (0.01) | -0.66 | (0.02) | -0.41 | (0.09) | 1.01 | (0.18) | 0.82 | (0.08) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.39 | (0.05) | -0.78 | (0.01) | -0.52 | (0.02) | 0.57 | (0.14) | 2.27 | (0.07) | 1.25 | (0.03) |
| Uruguay | -0.46 | (0.04) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.79 | (0.01) | -0.69 | (0.01) | 0.42 | (0.15) | 0.72 | (0.07) |
| Viet Nam | -0.43 | (0.06) | -0.80 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.02) | -0.58 | (0.03) | 0.39 | (0.21) | 0.72 | (0.11) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 2/2]
Index of school responsibility for resource allocation and mathematics performance

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| O Australia | 489 | (3.9) | 491 | (4.6) | 507 | (3.2) | 531 | (3.3) | 17.0 | (1.6) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.6) |
| Austria | 522 | (7.7) | 482 | (7.4) | 519 | (7.4) | 500 | (9.1) | 0.8 | (10.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| Belgium | 485 | (6.9) | 511 | (6.9) | 532 | (5.6) | 531 | (6.4) | 65.8 | (13.9) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 3.5 | (1.3) |
| Canada | 506 | (3.8) | 520 | (4.3) | 513 | (3.7) | 533 | (3.6) | 19.1 | (3.2) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.6) |
| Chile | 382 | (4.5) | 418 | (7.6) | 428 | (6.8) | 463 | (5.8) | 22.0 | (2.4) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 12.4 | (2.5) |
| Czech Republic | 507 | (8.9) | 508 | (8.7) | 493 | (6.2) | 487 | (7.1) | -7.1 | (3.3) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.9) |
| Denmark | 504 | (3.9) | 495 | (4.7) | 494 | (5.2) | 510 | (5.4) | 5.3 | (2.6) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) |
| Estonia | 509 | (4.6) | 526 | (4.0) | 524 | (4.5) | 522 | (4.5) | 2.3 | (3.8) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
| Finland | 515 | (4.0) | 516 | (5.0) | 526 | (3.5) | 517 | (3.5) | 7.5 | (3.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
| France | 497 | (8.8) | 491 | (8.3) | 499 | (7.0) | 493 | (7.2) | -23.9 | (11.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.5) |
| Germany | 516 | (8.8) | 514 | (7.6) | 510 | (7.2) | 514 | (8.5) | -7.2 | (31.7) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
| Greece | 449 | (7.0) | 447 | (5.5) | 452 | (5.8) | 464 | (6.3) | 34.9 | (27.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.6) |
| Hungary | 467 | (9.3) | 479 | (9.5) | 485 | (10.8) | 477 | (11.9) | 0.3 | (5.4) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.4) |
| Iceland | 496 | (3.4) | 495 | (3.2) | 491 | (3.4) | 493 | (3.4) | -0.4 | (2.2) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
| Ireland | 487 | (7.1) | 512 | (8.0) | 508 | (6.2) | 502 | (6.0) | 23.1 | (12.9) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.5) |
| Israel | 459 | (9.1) | 459 | (11.3) | 476 | (9.0) | 471 | (12.5) | -3.7 | (10.8) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.4) |
| Italy | 488 | (4.2) | 495 | (3.8) | 486 | (4.8) | 473 | (4.6) | -5.3 | (3.7) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
| Japan | 535 | (6.6) | 527 | (5.8) | 544 | (9.3) | 539 | (11.3) | 10.7 | (6.2) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.9) |
| Korea | 540 | (8.2) | 550 | (9.6) | 557 | (9.8) | 568 | (11.2) | 7.7 | (13.5) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.8) |
| Luxembourg | 507 | (1.8) | 503 | (2.1) | 483 | (2.4) | 466 | (2.0) | -8.2 | (1.2) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
| Mexico | 393 | (2.79) | 398 | (3.05) | 418 | (3.4) | 444 | (2.8) | 18.6 | (1.9) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (0.9) |
| Netherlands | 524 | (12.3) | 517 | (9.8) | 516 | (8.3) | 536 | (10.9) | 1.6 | (5.7) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.4) |
| New Zealand | 488 | (6.5) | 498 | (7.5) | 503 | (6.4) | 510 | (8.6) | 11.9 | (5.8) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.6) |
| Norway | 488 | (5.7) | 484 | (5.5) | 491 | (5.4) | 495 | (5.3) | 14.3 | (5.7) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.5) |
| Poland | 519 | (6.5) | 525 | (9.6) | 516 | (6.4) | 511 | (5.4) | 3.7 | (4.6) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| Portugal | 482 | (9.1) | 482 | (7.7) | 484 | (10.6) | 500 | (7.9) | 29.4 | (5.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 2.4 | (0.9) |
| Slovak Republic | 484 | (9.6) | 480 | (11.9) | 491 | (14.3) | 471 | (10.6) | -3.4 | (4.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.4) |
| Slovenia | 510 | (3.1) | 484 | (3.4) | 508 | (2.7) | 502 | (2.7) | 5.3 | (2.5) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
| Spain | 471 | (3.3) | 471 | (4.0) | 479 | (3.7) | 516 | (2.8) | 24.2 | (4.5) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.6) |
| Sweden | 475 | (4.7) | 475 | (6.5) | 478 | (4.6) | 485 | (4.8) | 3.5 | (2.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
| Switzerland | 520 | (5.0) | 551 | (7.9) | 533 | (7.7) | 523 | (7.6) | -11.2 | (5.4) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.6) |
| Turkey | 454 | (12.9) | 450 | (8.9) | 447 | (8.7) | 440 | (8.1) | -51.2 | (57.9) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.7) |
| United Kingdom | 484 | (3.8) | 485 | (6.4) | 494 | (10.1) | 513 | (7.0) | 8.0 | (3.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.8) |
| United States | 469 | (9.8) | 481 | (8.1) | 489 | (7.6) | 486 | (6.4) | 5.5 | (4.1) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.5) |
| OECD average | 489 | (1.2) | 492 | (1.2) | 496 | (1.2) | 500 | (1.2) | 6.5 | (2.4) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { § } \\ & \text { § } \end{aligned}$ | Albania | 394 | (4.4) | 396 | (4.6) | 389 | (3.5) | 398 | (4.5) | 7.6 | (3.4) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Brazil | 375 | (3.5) | 374 | (2.8) | 382 | (3.7) | 433 | (5.9) | 27.8 | (2.9) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (2.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 430 | (8.9) | 423 | (10.4) | 442 | (10.4) | 460 | (9.9) | 11.9 | (4.5) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (1.4) |
|  | Colombia | 375 | (4.1) | 369 | (4.7) | 362 | (5.6) | 399 | (8.0) | 17.3 | (4.8) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 4.6 | (2.5) |
|  | Costa Rica | 397 | (5.4) | 393 | (6.5) | 392 | (4.8) | 446 | (8.8) | 24.9 | (3.1) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 10.3 | (3.1) |
|  | Croatia | 474 | (9.2) | 477 | (7.0) | 469 | (9.6) | 465 | (8.9) | -8.5 | (14.2) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Cyprus* | 431 | (2.7) | 420 | (2.5) | 434 | (2.3) | 471 | (2.3) | 24.3 | (1.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 6.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 570 | (10.8) | 565 | (11.5) | 560 | (8.5) | 550 | (12.4) | -4.7 | (6.5) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 391 | (9.1) | 369 | (5.8) | 358 | (6.4) | 383 | (11.3) | 1.5 | (4.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Jordan | 373 | (5.6) | 371 | (5.0) | 385 | (4.8) | 413 | (9.2) | 29.8 | (9.5) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 6.2 | (3.5) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 434 | (5.4) | 431 | (5.4) | 429 | (7.1) | 433 | (8.3) | 6.9 | (9.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Latvia | 492 | (6.5) | 483 | (5.6) | 489 | (5.7) | 498 | (6.1) | 3.3 | (2.7) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | 514 | (9.2) | 479 | (8.9) | -33.2 | (4.8) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 9.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Lithuania | 474 | (7.2) | 481 | (7.5) | 483 | (7.2) | 478 | (6.9) | 0.2 | (2.8) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Macao-China | 543 | (1.9) | 545 | (2.4) | 534 | (2.4) | 530 | (2.2) | -3.4 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 428 | (7.0) | 415 | (7.2) | 413 | (5.7) | 426 | (8.2) | 27.9 | (8.4) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Montenegro | 411 | (2.6) | 421 | (3.3) | 408 | (2.4) | 399 | (2.3) | -14.8 | (2.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 345 | (6.4) | 351 | (6.1) | 353 | (6.4) | 423 | (9.4) | 24.0 | (2.7) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 15.4 | (3.1) |
|  | Qatar | 337 | (1.4) | 394 | (2.2) | 398 | (2.1) | 376 | (2.0) | 20.2 | (2.0) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 431 | (7.3) | 437 | (9.8) | 465 | (8.8) | 446 | (8.9) | 16.8 | (16.3) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Russian Federation | 470 | (5.8) | 476 | (8.7) | 489 | (5.9) | 495 | (7.0) | 8.6 | (5.3) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Serbia | 447 | (10.7) | 456 | (8.8) | 450 | (7.2) | 441 | (7.8) | -0.4 | (13.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 605 | (10.1) | 603 | (12.3) | 623 | (10.8) | 620 | (9.7) | 3.5 | (6.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Singapore | 567 | (2.6) | 554 | (2.7) | 567 | (3.2) | 605 | (3.3) | 34.3 | (5.4) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 570 | (11.1) | 581 | (8.8) | 568 | (9.1) | 515 | (9.6) | -28.3 | (4.9) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 6.2 | (2.0) |
|  | Thailand | 417 | (7.9) | 446 | (8.9) | 424 | (8.4) | 421 | (6.8) | -2.5 | (2.8) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 393 | (8.9) | 403 | (10.6) | 380 | (7.8) | 376 | (9.1) | -4.9 | (5.6) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.6) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 395 | (3.1) | 414 | (4.8) | 455 | (6.9) | 473 | (5.9) | 22.8 | (2.1) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 10.1 | (1.6) |
|  | Uruguay | 391 | (4.9) | 390 | (6.6) | 394 | (6.2) | 462 | (9.0) | 43.1 | (6.8) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 12.3 | (2.6) |
|  | Viet Nam | 503 | (9.7) | 496 | (12.1) | 526 | (12.2) | 520 | (9.5) | 8.5 | (4.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.6) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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School responsibility for resource allocation, curriculum and assessment,
by type of school and education level

|  |  | Index of school responsibility for resource allocation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  | Public schools |  | Private schools |  | Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) |  | Upper secondary education (ISCED 3) |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
|  | Australia | -0.43 | (0.02) | 0.77 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.03) | 0.11 | (0.05) | -0.06 | (0.04) | 0.40 | (0.06) | 0.14 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.05) |
|  | Austria | -0.57 | (0.03) | -0.41 | (0.06) | -0.63 | (0.02) | -0.55 | (0.03) | -0.29 | (0.07) | -0.34 | (0.16) | -0.11 | (0.17) | -0.31 | (0.07) |
|  | Belgium | -0.38 | (0.03) | -0.23 | (0.01) | -0.44 | (0.03) | -0.27 | (0.01) | -0.19 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.06) | -0.11 | (0.08) | -0.11 | (0.05) |
|  | Canada | -0.48 | (0.01) | 1.11 | (0.22) | -0.39 | (0.03) | -0.35 | (0.03) | -0.56 | (0.03) | 0.25 | (0.14) | -0.37 | (0.05) | -0.51 | (0.03) |
|  | Chile | -0.65 | (0.02) | 1.31 | (0.11) | -0.21 | (0.08) | 0.62 | (0.08) | -0.35 | (0.11) | 0.39 | (0.10) | -0.31 | (0.13) | 0.15 | (0.07) |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.47 | (0.10) | 2.01 | (0.27) | 1.22 | (0.12) | 1.23 | (0.14) | 1.03 | (0.06) | 1.05 | (0.15) | 0.72 | (0.08) | 0.78 | (0.11) |
|  | Denmark | -0.04 | (0.04) | 1.10 | (0.22) | 0.18 | (0.06) | 0.70 | (0.69) | -0.11 | (0.07) | 0.43 | (0.14) | -0.05 | (0.06) | -0.72 | (0.08) |
|  | Estonia | 0.12 | (0.05) | 0.83 | (0.47) | 0.14 | (0.04) | 0.42 | (0.25) | 0.50 | (0.05) | -0.08 | (0.24) | 0.49 | (0.05) | 0.20 | (0.20) |
|  | Finland | -0.34 | (0.02) | 1.68 | (0.39) | -0.28 | (0.02) | c | c | -0.06 | (0.07) | 0.72 | (0.17) | -0.05 | (0.07) | c | c |
|  | France | -0.62 | (0.01) | -0.26 | (0.08) | -0.49 | (0.05) | -0.57 | (0.01) | -0.19 | (0.06) | 0.48 | (0.21) | -0.02 | (0.11) | -0.14 | (0.07) |
|  | Germany | -0.62 | (0.01) | -0.49 | (0.05) | -0.58 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.04) | -0.14 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.29) | -0.19 | (0.05) | -0.35 | (0.16) |
|  | Greece | -0.72 | (0.01) | c | c | -0.75 | (0.01) | -0.70 | (0.01) | -1.17 | (0.01) | C | c | -1.19 | (0.03) | -1.14 | (0.02) |
|  | Hungary | 0.26 | (0.08) | 1.57 | (0.27) | 0.16 | (0.15) | 0.50 | (0.10) | -0.07 | (0.07) | 0.53 | (0.19) | 0.14 | (0.15) | 0.00 | (0.07) |
|  | Iceland | -0.05 | (0.00) | C | c | -0.04 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.16 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.15 | (0.00) | C | c |
|  | Ireland | -0.58 | (0.02) | -0.33 | (0.02) | -0.43 | (0.02) | -0.42 | (0.02) | 0.10 | (0.10) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.10 | (0.06) | 0.11 | (0.06) |
|  | Israel | -0.24 | (0.04) | c | c | -0.32 | (0.05) | -0.23 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.06) | C | c | -0.06 | (0.10) | 0.01 | (0.07) |
|  | Italy | -0.70 | (0.01) | 1.06 | (0.22) | -0.69 | (0.01) | -0.59 | (0.02) | 0.41 | (0.04) | 0.55 | (0.15) | 0.69 | (0.12) | 0.35 | (0.04) |
|  | Japan | -0.64 | (0.03) | 0.61 | (0.11) | c | c | -0.27 | (0.04) | 1.04 | (0.07) | 1.43 | (0.01) | C | c | 1.15 | (0.05) |
|  | Korea | -0.68 | (0.01) | -0.17 | (0.09) | -0.57 | (0.06) | -0.43 | (0.05) | 0.72 | (0.11) | 0.69 | (0.11) | 0.96 | (0.15) | 0.69 | (0.08) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.51 | (0.00) | 1.54 | (0.00) | -0.22 | (0.00) | -0.17 | (0.00) | -0.89 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.01) | -0.88 | (0.00) | -0.79 | (0.00) |
|  | Mexico | -0.55 | (0.01) | 1.39 | (0.15) | -0.56 | (0.02) | -0.17 | (0.03) | -0.94 | (0.01) | -0.30 | (0.11) | -0.89 | (0.02) | -0.86 | (0.02) |
|  | Netherlands | 1.16 | (0.15) | 1.65 | (0.12) | 1.21 | (0.11) | 1.38 | (0.17) | 1.30 | (0.07) | 1.18 | (0.07) | 1.00 | (0.08) | 0.88 | (0.13) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.10 | (0.05) | 1.56 | (0.42) | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.11 | (0.05) | 0.66 | (0.07) | 0.26 | (0.31) | 0.41 | (0.09) | 0.47 | (0.07) |
|  | Norway | -0.21 | (0.03) | C | C | -0.18 | (0.03) | C | c | -0.55 | (0.05) | C | c | -0.55 | (0.05) | c | c |
|  | Poland | -0.39 | (0.02) | 1.50 | (0.36) | -0.34 | (0.02) | C | c | 0.36 | (0.07) | 0.83 | (0.25) | 0.37 | (0.07) | c | C |
|  | Portugal | -0.58 | (0.02) | 0.40 | (0.25) | -0.52 | (0.02) | -0.44 | (0.04) | -0.72 | (0.03) | -0.27 | (0.21) | -0.63 | (0.05) | -0.71 | (0.04) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.77 | (0.09) | 0.90 | (0.28) | 0.81 | (0.10) | 0.75 | (0.14) | 0.53 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.20) | 0.39 | (0.10) | 0.55 | (0.12) |
|  | Slovenia | -0.13 | (0.02) | 1.03 | (0.08) | -0.06 | (0.27) | -0.12 | (0.01) | -0.31 | (0.01) | -0.79 | (0.00) | -0.48 | (0.19) | -0.34 | (0.01) |
|  | Spain | -0.69 | (0.01) | 0.14 | (0.10) | -0.42 | (0.03) | c | c | -0.66 | (0.04) | -0.06 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.04) | C | C |
|  | Sweden | 0.40 | (0.08) | 2.06 | (0.17) | 0.63 | (0.07) | 0.63 | (0.28) | -0.27 | (0.06) | -0.09 | (0.10) | -0.25 | (0.06) | -0.26 | (0.17) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.22 | (0.04) | 1.31 | (0.24) | -0.09 | (0.05) | -0.27 | (0.04) | -0.67 | (0.04) | 0.48 | (0.25) | -0.64 | (0.05) | -0.49 | (0.06) |
|  | Turkey | -0.73 | (0.01) | C | c | -0.70 | (0.04) | -0.72 | (0.01) | -1.14 | (0.02) | c | C | -1.01 | (0.14) | -1.12 | (0.02) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.80 | (0.09) | 1.73 | (0.11) | C | c | 1.10 | (0.08) | 0.93 | (0.06) | 1.25 | (0.06) | C | c | 0.93 | (0.05) |
|  | United States | 0.01 | (0.06) | 1.26 | (0.35) | -0.08 | (0.07) | 0.10 | (0.07) | -0.49 | (0.07) | 0.87 | (0.27) | -0.57 | (0.10) | -0.36 | (0.08) |
|  | OECD average | -0.20 | (0.01) | 0.92 | (0.04) | -0.14 | (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.01) | 0.33 | (0.03) | -0.10 | (0.02) | -0.06 | (0.02) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | -0.70 | (0.01) | 0.37 | (0.48) | -0.69 | (0.03) | -0.53 | (0.05) | -0.30 | (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.36) | -0.35 | (0.09) | -0.21 | (0.10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| こ | Argentina | c | C | C | c | C | C | C | c | -0.57 | (0.05) | -0.37 | (0.14) | -0.50 | (0.07) | -0.51 | (0.07) |
| む | Brazil | -0.73 | (0.01) | 1.74 | (0.16) | -0.58 | (0.04) | -0.26 | (0.05) | -0.59 | (0.03) | 0.39 | (0.14) | -0.52 | (0.04) | -0.39 | (0.04) |
|  | Bulgaria | 0.83 | (0.09) | C | c | 0.41 | (0.12) | 0.88 | (0.10) | -0.84 | (0.03) | C | c | -0.81 | (0.08) | -0.84 | (0.02) |
|  | Colombia | -0.68 | (0.01) | 1.39 | (0.30) | -0.44 | (0.05) | -0.31 | (0.05) | -0.20 | (0.07) | 0.61 | (0.14) | -0.07 | (0.08) | -0.09 | (0.07) |
|  | Costa Rica | -0.66 | (0.01) | 1.21 | (0.27) | -0.43 | (0.03) | -0.25 | (0.08) | -0.88 | (0.04) | 0.57 | (0.20) | -0.70 | (0.05) | -0.57 | (0.07) |
|  | Croatia | -0.36 | (0.02) | c | C | C | C | -0.34 | (0.03) | -0.85 | (0.03) | c | c | c | c | -0.86 | (0.03) |
|  | Cyprus* | -0.69 | (0.00) | 1.46 | (0.00) | $\mathbf{- 0 . 5 9}$ | (0.01) | -0.33 | (0.00) | -1.11 | (0.00) | 0.55 | (0.00) | -0.95 | (0.01) | -0.84 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.48 | (0.04) | 0.48 | (0.10) | 0.40 | (0.08) | 0.43 | (0.10) | 0.98 | (0.32) | 0.99 | (0.07) | 0.98 | (0.07) | 0.95 | (0.07) |
|  | Indonesia | -0.31 | (0.10) | 1.27 | (0.14) | 0.39 | (0.12) | 0.28 | (0.12) | 0.49 | (0.11) | 0.86 | (0.12) | 0.77 | (0.11) | 0.54 | (0.12) |
|  | Jordan | -0.67 | (0.02) | 0.26 | (0.14) | -0.51 | (0.03) | c | c | -1.12 | (0.04) | -0.61 | (0.13) | -1.04 | (0.04) | C | C |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.38 | (0.04) | 1.34 | (0.45) | -0.37 | (0.04) | -0.23 | (0.10) | -0.77 | (0.05) | -0.21 | (0.34) | -0.81 | (0.04) | -0.62 | (0.09) |
|  | Latvia | 0.56 | (0.08) | c | c | 0.58 | (0.08) | 0.92 | (0.26) | -0.21 | (0.06) | c | c | -0.20 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.21) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.27 | (0.01) | C | c | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.00) | -0.45 | (0.02) | C | c | -0.24 | (0.02) | -0.95 | (0.00) |
|  | Lithuania | 0.76 | (0.08) | C | C | 0.78 | (0.08) | c | c | 0.65 | (0.05) | C | c | 0.66 | (0.05) | c | c |
|  | Macao-China | c | c | 1.73 | (0.00) | 1.69 | (0.00) | 1.58 | (0.00) | c | C | 0.81 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.00) | 0.67 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | -0.58 | (0.01) | 2.09 | (0.45) | -0.43 | (0.06) | -0.49 | (0.03) | -0.95 | (0.04) | 1.07 | (0.30) | -0.79 | (0.05) | -0.88 | (0.04) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.34 | (0.00) | c | C | C | C | -0.33 | (0.00) | -0.84 | (0.00) | c | c | C | c | -0.83 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -0.51 | (0.05) | 2.32 | (0.18) | -0.11 | (0.10) | 0.29 | (0.08) | -0.41 | (0.07) | 0.99 | (0.13) | -0.21 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.06) |
|  | Qatar | -0.39 | (0.00) | -0.33 | (0.00) | -0.37 | (0.00) | -0.37 | (0.00) | -0.94 | (0.00) | -0.84 | (0.00) | -0.93 | (0.00) | -0.90 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | -0.57 | (0.02) | c | c | -0.57 | (0.02) | c | c | -0.52 | (0.05) | c | C | -0.52 | (0.05) | C | c |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.01 | (0.06) | C | c | 0.02 | (0.07) | 0.08 | (0.08) | -0.22 | (0.05) | C | C | -0.22 | (0.06) | -0.26 | (0.09) |
|  | Serbia | -0.41 | (0.02) | C | c | c | c | -0.39 | (0.02) | -0.87 | (0.02) | c | C | c | c | -0.86 | (0.02) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.38 | (0.04) | 0.67 | (0.30) | -0.32 | (0.08) | -0.26 | (0.06) | -0.55 | (0.05) | -0.57 | (0.23) | -0.77 | (0.07) | -0.39 | (0.06) |
|  | Singapore | -0.40 | (0.00) | c | c | -0.43 | (0.05) | -0.36 | (0.01) | -0.24 | (0.00) | C | c | -0.31 | (0.06) | -0.25 | (0.01) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | -0.41 | (0.03) | 0.93 | (0.17) | -0.34 | (0.04) | 0.31 | (0.08) | 0.15 | (0.09) | 0.34 | (0.12) | 0.10 | (0.11) | 0.28 | (0.09) |
|  | Thailand | 0.46 | (0.08) | 1.94 | (0.20) | 0.58 | (0.11) | 0.74 | (0.08) | 0.95 | (0.06) | 1.15 | (0.11) | 1.05 | (0.07) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.20 | (0.06) | c | c | -0.29 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.09) | -0.58 | (0.08) | c | c | -0.62 | (0.12) | -0.56 | (0.10) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | -0.56 | (0.03) | 1.09 | (0.10) | 0.28 | (0.10) | 0.40 | (0.05) | -1.07 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.07) | -0.39 | (0.08) | -0.44 | (0.04) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.73 | (0.01) | 0.89 | (0.20) | -0.64 | (0.04) | -0.34 | (0.05) | -1.02 | (0.02) | 0.11 | (0.21) | -0.96 | (0.03) | -0.74 | (0.06) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.54 | (0.04) | 1.03 | (0.58) | -0.71 | (0.02) | -0.40 | (0.06) | -1.05 | (0.03) | -0.48 | (0.38) | -1.16 | (0.04) | -0.96 | (0.04) |

[^31]Part 1/2]
Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance
Table IV.4.3 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 0.13 | (0.04) | -0.78 | (0.01) | -0.42 | (0.03) | 0.27 | (0.13) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.02) |
|  | Austria | -0.30 | (0.06) | -0.97 | (0.03) | -0.77 | (0.03) | -0.35 | (0.09) | 0.91 | (0.16) | 0.79 | (0.05) |
|  | Belgium | -0.11 | (0.05) | -0.85 | (0.02) | -0.52 | (0.02) | -0.23 | (0.05) | 1.17 | (0.14) | 0.82 | (0.03) |
|  | Canada | -0.49 | (0.03) | -0.98 | (0.02) | -0.80 | (0.01) | -0.57 | (0.02) | 0.39 | (0.11) | 0.66 | (0.04) |
|  | Chile | 0.12 | (0.07) | -0.93 | (0.03) | -0.53 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.22) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.75 | (0.06) | -0.74 | (0.05) | 0.85 | (0.22) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.96 | (0.03) |
|  | Denmark | -0.05 | (0.06) | -0.88 | (0.02) | -0.66 | (0.04) | -0.09 | (0.17) | 1.44 | (0.05) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
|  | Estonia | 0.49 | (0.05) | -0.71 | (0.03) | -0.10 | (0.07) | 1.32 | (0.14) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.01) |
|  | Finland | -0.05 | (0.07) | -0.85 | (0.01) | -0.59 | (0.04) | -0.17 | (0.17) | 1.43 | (0.12) | 0.90 | (0.03) |
|  | France | -0.10 | (0.06) | -0.88 | (0.02) | -0.61 | (0.04) | -0.17 | (0.06) | 1.26 | (0.17) | 0.86 | (0.04) |
|  | Germany | -0.19 | (0.05) | -0.87 | (0.02) | -0.65 | (0.05) | -0.27 | (0.05) | 1.03 | (0.13) | 0.79 | (0.03) |
|  | Greece | -1.15 | (0.02) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.16 | (0.03) | -0.91 | (0.07) | 0.26 | (0.09) |
|  | Hungary | 0.02 | (0.07) | -0.85 | (0.03) | -0.52 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.17) | 1.35 | (0.07) | 0.87 | (0.03) |
|  | Iceland | 0.15 | (0.00) | $-0.83$ | (0.00) | -0.58 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.02) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.00) |
|  | Ireland | 0.10 | (0.06) | -0.76 | (0.03) | -0.35 | (0.04) | 0.11 | (0.16) | 1.41 | (0.06) | 0.84 | (0.03) |
|  | Israel | 0.00 | (0.06) | -0.85 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.16) | 1.42 | (0.08) | 0.89 | (0.03) |
|  | Italy | 0.36 | (0.04) | -0.75 | (0.02) | -0.25 | (0.04) | 0.98 | (0.11) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
|  | Japan | 1.15 | (0.05) | 0.30 | (0.21) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.69 | (0.06) |
|  | Korea | 0.71 | (0.08) | -0.72 | (0.08) | 0.66 | (0.25) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.84 | (0.00) | -1.11 | (0.00) | -0.90 | (0.00) | -0.81 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.00) | 0.36 | (0.00) |
|  | Mexico | -0.87 | (0.02) | -1.24 | (0.01) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.90 | (0.02) | -0.24 | (0.05) | 0.52 | (0.02) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.96 | (0.08) | -0.43 | (0.23) | 1.41 | (0.12) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.06) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.47 | (0.07) | -0.68 | (0.04) | -0.09 | (0.07) | 1.20 | (0.20) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
|  | Norway | -0.55 | (0.05) | -1.03 | (0.03) | -0.81 | (0.00) | -0.69 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.16) | 0.65 | (0.06) |
|  | Poland | 0.37 | (0.07) | -0.49 | (0.05) | -0.14 | (0.04) | 0.65 | (0.21) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.82 | (0.02) |
|  | Portugal | -0.68 | (0.03) | -1.06 | (0.02) | -0.85 | (0.02) | -0.74 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.11) | 0.50 | (0.06) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.48 | (0.08) | -0.76 | (0.02) | -0.20 | (0.26) | 1.44 | (0.11) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.02) |
|  | Slovenia | -0.35 | (0.01) | -0.86 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.50 | (0.01) | 0.73 | (0.04) | 0.73 | (0.01) |
|  | Spain | -0.47 | (0.04) | -1.04 | (0.03) | -0.80 | (0.01) | -0.55 | (0.04) | 0.51 | (0.12) | 0.71 | (0.04) |
|  | Sweden | -0.25 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.01) | -0.67 | (0.02) | -0.42 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.17) | 0.79 | (0.04) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.60 | (0.04) | -1.08 | (0.03) | -0.83 | (0.02) | -0.71 | (0.03) | 0.21 | (0.12) | 0.62 | (0.05) |
|  | Turkey | -1.12 | (0.02) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.25 | (0.00) | -1.18 | (0.02) | -0.79 | (0.09) | 0.32 | (0.07) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.93 | (0.05) | -0.45 | (0.07) | 1.27 | (0.15) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.03) |
|  | United States | -0.39 | (0.08) | -1.06 | (0.03) | -0.82 | (0.01) | -0.61 | (0.07) | 0.94 | (0.23) | 0.86 | (0.06) |
|  | OECD average | -0.04 | (0.01) | -0.84 | (0.01) | -0.38 | (0.01) | 0.12 | (0.02) | 0.93 | (0.02) | 0.78 | (0.01) |
| \%※む | Albania | -0.27 | (0.07) | -1.01 | (0.03) | -0.81 | (0.01) | -0.42 | (0.11) | 1.17 | (0.18) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
|  | Argentina | -0.51 | (0.06) | -1.02 | (0.03) | -0.81 | (0.00) | -0.59 | (0.07) | 0.40 | (0.16) | 0.66 | (0.06) |
|  | Brazil | -0.42 | (0.03) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.86 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.05) | 0.75 | (0.09) | 0.79 | (0.03) |
|  | Bulgaria | -0.84 | (0.03) | -1.12 | (0.02) | -0.99 | (0.01) | -0.83 | (0.02) | -0.43 | (0.09) | 0.35 | (0.06) |
|  | Colombia | -0.08 | (0.07) | -1.02 | (0.04) | -0.63 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.15) | 1.18 | (0.06) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
|  | Costa Rica | -0.65 | (0.05) | -1.18 | (0.02) | -1.06 | (0.02) | -0.84 | (0.03) | 0.50 | (0.17) | 0.81 | (0.06) |
|  | Croatia | -0.86 | (0.03) | -1.12 | (0.01) | -1.00 | (0.02) | -0.87 | (0.02) | -0.44 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.05) |
|  | Cyprus* | -0.84 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.23 | (0.00) | -1.10 | (0.00) | 0.22 | (0.00) | 0.81 | (0.00) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.96 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.11) | 1.32 | (0.21) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.80 | (0.04) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.65 | (0.08) | -0.76 | (0.08) | 0.48 | (0.26) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
|  | Jordan | -1.04 | (0.04) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.22 | (0.02) | -0.40 | (0.15) | 0.61 | (0.08) |
|  | Kazakhstan | -0.76 | (0.05) | -1.21 | (0.02) | -1.02 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.15) | 0.55 | (0.06) |
|  | Latvia | -0.19 | (0.06) | -0.89 | (0.02) | -0.66 | (0.04) | -0.29 | (0.06) | 1.08 | (0.16) | 0.82 | (0.04) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.33 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.90 | (0.01) |
|  | Lithuania | 0.66 | (0.05) | -0.57 | (0.05) | 0.34 | (0.15) | 1.42 | (0.06) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.02) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.78 | (0.00) | -0.60 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.00) |
|  | Malaysia | -0.88 | (0.04) | -1.23 | (0.01) | -1.11 | (0.01) | -0.96 | (0.04) | -0.22 | (0.12) | 0.58 | (0.06) |
|  | Montenegro | -0.83 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.10 | (0.00) | -0.91 | (0.00) | -0.06 | (0.00) | 0.62 | (0.00) |
|  | Peru | -0.09 | (0.05) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.75 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.18) | 1.44 | (0.01) | 1.02 | (0.03) |
|  | Qatar | -0.90 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.18 | (0.00) | -0.83 | (0.00) | -0.34 | (0.00) | 0.50 | (0.00) |
|  | Romania | -0.52 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.02) | -0.87 | (0.03) | -0.57 | (0.06) | 0.50 | (0.15) | 0.71 | (0.05) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.22 | (0.05) | -0.97 | (0.02) | -0.69 | (0.05) | -0.25 | (0.06) | 1.02 | (0.14) | 0.82 | (0.04) |
|  | Serbia | -0.86 | (0.02) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.94 | (0.02) | -0.82 | (0.01) | -0.61 | (0.05) | 0.21 | (0.02) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.56 | (0.05) | -1.22 | (0.02) | -0.97 | (0.05) | -0.71 | (0.05) | 0.68 | (0.13) | 0.82 | (0.04) |
|  | Singapore | -0.25 | (0.01) | -0.87 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.00) | -0.33 | (0.01) | 0.97 | (0.03) | 0.80 | (0.01) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 0.21 | (0.07) | -0.86 | (0.03) | -0.40 | (0.10) | 0.67 | (0.19) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.02) |
|  | Thailand | 0.98 | (0.05) | -0.20 | (0.09) | 1.24 | (0.15) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.04) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.58 | (0.08) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.22 | (0.02) | -0.89 | (0.10) | 1.04 | (0.21) | 1.01 | (0.06) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | -0.44 | (0.04) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.12 | (0.02) | -0.61 | (0.06) | 1.25 | (0.09) | 1.03 | (0.03) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.83 | (0.04) | -1.26 | (0.01) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.90 | (0.02) | -0.08 | (0.15) | 0.61 | (0.07) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.98 | (0.03) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.23 | (0.02) | -1.07 | (0.03) | -0.37 | (0.11) | 0.50 | (0.05) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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[Part 2/2]
Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance
Table IV.4.3 Results based on school principals' reports


[^32]
[Part 1/1]
School choice
Table IV.4.4 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported on the number of schools competing for students in the same area |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Two or more other schools |  | One other school |  | No other schools |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 88.6 | (1.4) | 5.9 | (0.9) | 5.5 | (0.9) |
| $\bigcirc$ Austria | 42.1 | (3.6) | 18.4 | (3.1) | 39.5 | (3.2) |
| Belgium | 80.2 | (2.2) | 14.3 | (2.0) | 5.5 | (1.5) |
| Canada | 67.2 | (2.2) | 14.6 | (1.8) | 18.2 | (1.6) |
| Chile | 65.8 | (3.7) | 18.5 | (3.0) | 15.8 | (2.5) |
| Czech Republic | 72.8 | (3.2) | 12.4 | (2.7) | 14.8 | (2.3) |
| Denmark | 65.4 | (2.8) | 19.2 | (2.8) | 15.4 | (2.6) |
| Estonia | 61.8 | (2.2) | 19.6 | (2.0) | 18.6 | (2.0) |
| Finland | 30.7 | (2.6) | 16.1 | (2.9) | 53.2 | (3.3) |
| France | 43.8 | (3.5) | 19.0 | (2.9) | 37.2 | (3.4) |
| Germany | 58.8 | (3.2) | 24.9 | (3.0) | 16.3 | (2.5) |
| Greece | 43.4 | (3.6) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 32.5 | (3.0) |
| Hungary | 54.2 | (3.7) | 23.0 | (3.3) | 22.8 | (3.3) |
| Iceland | 32.3 | (0.2) | 15.6 | (0.1) | 52.1 | (0.2) |
| Ireland | 74.8 | (3.3) | 11.6 | (2.7) | 13.5 | (2.5) |
| Israel | 58.5 | (3.9) | 20.0 | (3.2) | 21.5 | (3.4) |
| Italy | 35.3 | (1.9) | 21.8 | (1.6) | 42.9 | (1.8) |
| Japan | 85.0 | (2.5) | 5.3 | (1.7) | 9.8 | (1.8) |
| Korea | 70.9 | (3.4) | 19.9 | (3.1) | 9.1 | (2.5) |
| Luxembourg | 63.1 | (0.1) | 11.8 | (0.1) | 25.2 | (0.1) |
| Mexico | 72.4 | (1.6) | 16.1 | (1.4) | 11.5 | (1.0) |
| Netherlands | 76.6 | (3.4) | 13.8 | (2.8) | 9.5 | (2.1) |
| New Zealand | 85.7 | (2.7) | 7.5 | (2.1) | 6.9 | (2.1) |
| Norway | 17.9 | (2.9) | 17.0 | (2.9) | 65.1 | (3.4) |
| Poland | 54.1 | (3.6) | 18.2 | (3.1) | 27.7 | (3.0) |
| Portugal | 56.4 | (3.7) | 21.0 | (3.6) | 22.6 | (2.9) |
| Slovak Republic | 75.7 | (2.9) | 10.0 | (2.1) | 14.3 | (1.9) |
| Slovenia | 62.5 | (0.5) | 13.5 | (0.4) | 24.0 | (0.5) |
| Spain | 67.6 | (2.7) | 16.5 | (2.5) | 15.9 | (1.9) |
| Sweden | 55.2 | (3.1) | 14.5 | (2.8) | 30.3 | (3.0) |
| Switzerland | 25.5 | (2.4) | 16.8 | (2.4) | 57.6 | (3.0) |
| Turkey | 69.1 | (3.0) | 9.7 | (1.9) | 21.1 | (2.8) |
| United Kingdom | 82.1 | (2.4) | 9.6 | (2.0) | 8.3 | (1.6) |
| United States | 68.6 | (4.1) | 7.3 | (2.4) | 24.2 | (3.9) |
| OECD average | 60.7 | (0.5) | 15.5 | (0.4) | 23.8 | (0.4) |
| in Albania | 44.5 | (4.1) | 22.1 | (3.7) | 33.4 | (3.7) |
| Argentina | 77.9 | (3.5) | 8.1 | (1.8) | 14.0 | (3.1) |
| ※ Brazil | 51.7 | (2.1) | 22.0 | (2.1) | 26.4 | (2.1) |
| Bulgaria | 74.5 | (3.0) | 12.6 | (2.2) | 12.9 | (2.5) |
| Colombia | 69.4 | (3.3) | 16.8 | (3.1) | 13.8 | (2.7) |
| Costa Rica | 65.6 | (3.4) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 18.7 | (2.8) |
| Croatia | 70.1 | (3.7) | 9.4 | (2.4) | 20.4 | (3.2) |
| Cyprus* | 38.3 | (0.1) | 17.9 | (0.1) | 43.8 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 93.7 | (2.1) | 5.1 | (1.9) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Indonesia | 85.9 | (2.9) | 11.0 | (2.6) | 3.2 | (1.5) |
| Jordan | 50.3 | (3.3) | 22.1 | (3.4) | 27.5 | (3.2) |
| Kazakhstan | 48.1 | (3.7) | 18.2 | (3.5) | 33.6 | (3.6) |
| Latvia | 74.0 | (3.2) | 19.5 | (3.2) | 6.5 | (1.7) |
| Liechtenstein | 9.2 | (0.4) | 31.3 | (0.8) | 59.5 | (0.8) |
| Lithuania | 52.1 | (3.2) | 21.9 | (2.9) | 26.0 | (2.7) |
| Macao-China | 87.3 | (0.0) | 8.8 | (0.0) | 3.9 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 61.1 | (3.8) | 22.2 | (3.6) | 16.7 | (2.9) |
| Montenegro | 24.7 | (0.2) | 22.0 | (0.1) | 53.4 | (0.2) |
| Peru | 67.8 | (2.8) | 12.5 | (2.1) | 19.7 | (2.6) |
| Qatar | 57.1 | (0.1) | 17.0 | (0.1) | 25.9 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 56.5 | (4.2) | 17.1 | (3.0) | 26.4 | (3.4) |
| Russian Federation | 56.7 | (3.6) | 20.0 | (2.9) | 23.3 | (2.7) |
| Serbia | 63.1 | (4.0) | 14.9 | (2.6) | 21.9 | (3.7) |
| Shanghai-China | 72.5 | (3.5) | 10.8 | (2.8) | 16.8 | (2.9) |
| Singapore | 92.7 | (0.1) | 6.7 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
| Chinese Taipei | 83.7 | (2.3) | 12.3 | (2.4) | 4.0 | (1.5) |
| Thailand | 74.7 | (3.0) | 14.3 | (2.7) | 11.0 | (2.2) |
| Tunisia | 38.5 | (3.5) | 29.4 | (3.3) | 32.1 | (3.5) |
| United Arab Emirates | 75.9 | (1.9) | 14.4 | (1.7) | 9.7 | (1.6) |
| Uruguay | 40.6 | (3.2) | 15.7 | (2.7) | 43.7 | (3.3) |
| Viet Nam | 50.3 | (4.0) | 28.2 | (3.9) | 21.5 | (3.3) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[Part 1/1]
School choice, by level of education
Table IV.4.5 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/1]
School admissions policies and school competition
Table IV.4.6 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/2]
School type and performance in mathematics, reading and science
Table IV.4.7 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Government or public schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Government-dependent private schools ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Performance } \\ \text { on the } \\ \text { mathematics scale } \end{gathered}$ |  | Performance on the reading scale |  | Performance on the science scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance <br> on the <br> mathematics scale |  | Performance on the reading scale |  | Performance on the science scale |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 61.0 | (0.7) | 489 | (2.3) | 495 | (2.4) | 506 | (2.5) | 26.5 | (1.0) | 510 | (2.9) | 520 | (2.9) | 527 | (3.2) |
|  | Austria | 91.4 | (2.3) | 502 | (3.2) | 486 | (3.4) | 502 | (3.2) | 7.5 | (2.1) | 546 | (15.9) | 532 | (13.7) | 550 | (13.1) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 92.2 | (0.8) | 514 | (2.0) | 519 | (2.2) | 523 | (2.2) | 4.3 | (0.6) | 570 | (8.1) | 567 | (9.4) | 550 | (6.7) |
|  | Chile | 37.5 | (1.6) | 390 | (5.0) | 410 | (5.0) | 412 | (4.5) | 48.1 | (2.7) | 424 | (4.9) | 444 | (4.5) | 447 | (4.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 91.8 | (1.9) | 498 | (3.8) | 491 | (3.9) | 507 | (3.7) | 6.9 | (1.6) | 493 | (17.3) | 502 | (17.2) | 511 | (15.9) |
|  | Denmark | 77.0 | (1.8) | 494 | (2.5) | 489 | (3.1) | 491 | (2.9) | 18.9 | (2.0) | 517 | (6.2) | 520 | (6.3) | 519 | (7.1) |
|  | Estonia | 97.5 | (1.0) | 520 | (2.0) | 516 | (2.1) | 541 | (2.0) | 1.9 | (1.0) | 509 | (36.3) | 522 | (39.7) | 531 | (44.0) |
|  | Finland | 97.0 | (0.7) | 518 | (2.0) | 523 | (2.5) | 545 | (2.3) | 3.0 | (0.7) | 542 | (7.2) | 555 | (8.0) | 561 | (8.0) |
|  | France | 82.8 | (1.4) | 490 | (3.2) | 503 | (3.4) | 495 | (3.2) | 17.2 | (1.4) | 521 | (6.6) | 529 | (9.3) | 521 | (7.3) |
|  | Germany | 94.5 | (1.6) | 511 | (3.5) | 506 | (3.6) | 521 | (3.8) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 549 | (19.4) | 541 | (18.8) | 549 | (18.6) |
|  | Greece | 97.7 | (0.7) | 450 | (2.7) | 474 | (3.5) | 464 | (3.3) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Hungary | 84.0 | (2.9) | 475 | (3.4) | 485 | (3.8) | 493 | (3.4) | 16.0 | (2.9) | 489 | (14.1) | 507 | (10.7) | 505 | (11.6) |
|  | Iceland | 99.5 | (0.1) | 493 | (1.7) | 483 | (1.8) | 478 | (2.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | c |  | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 43.8 | (0.9) | 492 | (3.9) | 510 | (4.5) | 511 | (4.2) | 54.0 | (1.1) | 502 | (3.0) | 527 | (3.1) | 524 | (3.2) |
|  | Israel | 100.0 | c | 466 | (4.7) | 485 | (5.0) | 469 | (4.9) | 0.0 | , | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Italy | 95.3 | (0.7) | 487 | (2.3) | 492 | (2.3) | 495 | (2.1) | 1.8 | (0.4) | 437 | (7.1) | 433 | (10.9) | 454 | (8.7) |
|  | Japan | 70.1 | (1.2) | 535 | (3.3) | 537 | (3.8) | 548 | (3.5) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Korea | 52.7 | (4.1) | 546 | (7.1) | 529 | (6.2) | 532 | (5.6) | 31.4 | (3.8) | 539 | (7.2) | 525 | (6.0) | 527 | (5.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 84.9 | (0.1) | 492 | (1.3) | 487 | (1.7) | 493 | (1.4) | 13.4 | (0.0) | 464 | (2.4) | 478 | (3.2) | 467 | (2.5) |
|  | Mexico | 90.7 | (0.9) | 408 | (1.5) | 418 | (1.7) | 410 | (1.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Netherlands | 33.6 | (4.4) | 516 | (10.0) | 508 | (9.8) | 519 | (9.2) | 66.4 | (4.4) | 523 | (5.6) | 511 | (5.5) | 521 | (5.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 94.7 | (1.4) | 496 | (2.5) | 509 | (2.9) | 512 | (2.6) | 0.0 | , | c | , | c | c | c | c |
|  | Norway | 98.3 | (1.0) | 489 | (2.8) | 504 | (3.2) | 494 | (3.2) | 1.7 | (1.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 97.1 | (0.4) | 516 | (3.6) | 517 | (3.1) | 524 | (3.1) | 1.9 | (0.4) | 566 | (22.1) | 562 | (29.3) | 567 | (24.9) |
|  | Portugal | 89.9 | (2.0) | 481 | (3.8) | 482 | (3.7) | 484 | (3.8) | 5.8 | (1.9) | 516 | (7.3) | 517 | (9.1) | 513 | (8.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 91.0 | (2.4) | 478 | (4.1) | 458 | (5.0) | 468 | (4.4) | 8.6 | (2.5) | 520 | (20.2) | 513 | (21.0) | 508 | (18.0) |
|  | Slovenia | 97.6 | (0.1) | 501 | (1.3) | 481 | (1.2) | 514 | (1.4) | 2.4 | (0.1) | 589 | (6.9) | 571 | (6.5) | 601 | (6.7) |
|  | Spain | 68.2 | (0.8) | 471 | (2.5) | 476 | (2.5) | 485 | (2.5) | 24.4 | (1.1) | 506 | (3.6) | 507 | (3.9) | 515 | (3.3) |
|  | Sweden | 86.0 | (0.7) | 476 | (2.4) | 480 | (3.3) | 482 | (3.3) | 14.0 | (0.7) | 491 | (7.9) | 505 | (9.2) | 501 | (8.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 93.7 | (1.3) | 532 | (3.3) | 509 | (2.9) | 515 | (3.0) | 1.5 | (0.8) | 567 | (18.4) | 540 | (18.4) | 529 | (10.6) |
|  | Turkey | 100.0 | c | 447 | (4.9) | 475 | (4.2) | 463 | (3.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | United Kingdom | 56.2 | (3.1) | 485 | (3.6) | 492 | (4.1) | 506 | (4.1) | 36.0 | (3.2) | 494 | (7.6) | 499 | (8.8) | 515 | (8.0) |
|  | United States | 94.9 | (0.9) | 482 | (4.0) | 497 | (4.1) | 498 | (4.2) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | OECD average | 81.7 | (0.3) | 489 | (0.7) | 491 | (0.7) | 496 | (0.6) | 14.2 | (0.4) | 517 | (2.6) | 518 | (2.8) | 521 | (2.7) |


| ¢ Albania | 91.7 | (2.1) | 393 | (2.2) | 393 | (3.3) | 397 | (2.6) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 67.7 | (2.3) | 368 | (4.1) | 370 | (4.2) | 382 | (4.4) | 25.6 | (2.9) | 428 | (5.7) | 448 | (7.5) | 454 | (5.3) |
| ® Brazil | 86.5 | (1.3) | 376 | (2.0) | 396 | (2.3) | 390 | (2.2) | 0.6 | (0.4) | c | c | c | C | c | c |
| Bulgaria | 98.8 | (0.9) | 438 | (4.1) | 435 | (6.1) | 446 | (4.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | C | c | C |
| Colombia | 85.9 | (1.4) | 369 | (2.8) | 394 | (3.5) | 392 | (3.0) | 4.0 | (0.8) | 362 | (8.0) | 393 | (8.2) | 375 | (8.1) |
| Costa Rica | 86.9 | (1.4) | 396 | (3.3) | 430 | (3.8) | 419 | (3.2) | 3.6 | (0.9) | 465 | (17.1) | 498 | (15.2) | 490 | (14.2) |
| Croatia | 98.2 | (1.1) | 471 | (3.6) | 484 | (3.4) | 491 | (3.2) | 0.8 | (0.8) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Cyprus* | 83.9 | (0.0) | 430 | (1.3) | 444 | (1.4) | 429 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | C |
| Hong Kong-China | 7.0 | (0.2) | 597 | (9.5) | 571 | (9.1) | 582 | (7.7) | 91.9 | (0.8) | 560 | (3.5) | 543 | (3.0) | 554 | (2.8) |
| Indonesia | 58.9 | (2.6) | 377 | (5.0) | 399 | (5.5) | 385 | (4.8) | 17.5 | (2.3) | 342 | (5.6) | 362 | (7.0) | 352 | (5.7) |
| Jordan | 83.3 | (1.5) | 376 | (3.1) | 390 | (4.0) | 400 | (3.3) | 0.9 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | c | C |
| Kazakhstan | 97.2 | (1.0) | 432 | (3.0) | 392 | (2.8) | 425 | (3.0) | 0.7 | (0.5) | c | C | c | C | c | C |
| Latvia | 97.7 | (1.5) | 490 | (2.9) | 488 | (2.5) | 501 | (2.9) | 0.4 | (0.4) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Liechtenstein | 93.6 | (0.4) | 541 | (3.9) | 519 | (4.3) | 528 | (3.6) | 0.0 | c | C | c | C | C | c | C |
| Lithuania | 98.6 | (0.7) | 478 | (2.7) | 476 | (2.5) | 495 | (2.6) | 1.1 | (0.6) | C | c | C | c | c | C |
| Macao-China | 4.2 | (0.0) | c | c | c | C | c | c | 81.3 | (0.0) | 537 | (1.1) | 509 | (0.9) | 520 | (0.9) |
| Malaysia | 96.6 | (0.7) | 418 | (3.2) | 397 | (3.2) | 418 | (2.9) | 0.0 | c | C | c | c | c | C | c |
| Montenegro | 99.6 | (0.0) | 410 | (1.1) | 422 | (1.2) | 410 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | c | C | C | C | C | C |
| Peru | 85.3 | (1.8) | 350 | (3.2) | 366 | (3.8) | 358 | (3.2) | 0.0 | C | c | C | c | c | C | c |
| Qatar | 61.9 | (0.1) | 335 | (1.0) | 350 | (1.0) | 341 | (0.9) | 0.9 | (0.0) | c | c | c | C | C | C |
| Romania | 99.4 | (0.6) | 444 | (3.7) | 437 | (3.9) | 438 | (3.2) | 0.0 | c | C | c | c | c | c | C |
| Russian Federation | 99.4 | (0.6) | 482 | (3.0) | 474 | (3.0) | 486 | (2.9) | 0.0 | c | c | C | C | C | C | C |
| Serbia | 99.6 | (0.4) | 448 | (3.9) | 446 | (3.8) | 444 | (3.8) | 0.0 | c | C | c | c | c | c | c |
| Shanghai-China | 90.7 | (1.8) | 609 | (3.4) | 567 | (2.8) | 578 | (3.1) | 0.0 | c | C | C | C | c | C | C |
| Singapore | 97.6 | (0.7) | 574 | (1.2) | 542 | (1.2) | 552 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | C | c | C | c | c | c |
| Chinese Taipei | 67.6 | (1.4) | 581 | (3.7) | 538 | (3.3) | 539 | (2.7) | 4.6 | (1.3) | 469 | (9.5) | 465 | (10.6) | 458 | (9.4) |
| Thailand | 83.5 | (0.6) | 433 | (3.8) | 447 | (3.3) | 450 | (3.2) | 11.6 | (1.5) | 396 | (5.1) | 412 | (4.7) | 417 | (4.6) |
| Tunisia | 99.4 | (0.4) | 389 | (3.9) | 405 | (4.5) | 399 | (3.5) | 0.0 | c | C | c | C | c | C | C |
| United Arab Emirates | 54.5 | (1.7) | 399 | (2.6) | 413 | (2.8) | 419 | (2.9) | 0.6 | (0.4) | c | c | C | c | c | C |
| Uruguay | 83.3 | (1.2) | 393 | (2.6) | 394 | (3.2) | 399 | (2.8) | 0.0 | c | c | c | C | c | c | c |
| Viet Nam | 92.6 | (1.1) | 513 | (5.1) | 510 | (4.7) | 530 | (4.6) | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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[Part 2/2]
School type and performance in mathematics, reading and science
Table IV.4.7

|  |  | Government-independent private schools ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools after accounting for the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale | Performance on the reading scale | Performance on the science scale |  | Public schools |  | Private schools (governmentdependent and governmentindependent) |  | Difference |  | Students |  | Students and schools |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Dif.  <br> (Pub. -  <br> Priv.)  <br> S.E.  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Dif. (Pub. - <br> Priv.) | S.E. | Dif. (Pub. Priv.) | S.E. | Dif. (Pub. Priv.) | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { OU } \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 12.5 | (0.9) | 559 (3.6) | 567 (3.8) | 576 (3.9) | -37 (3.4) | 0.06 | (0.0) | 0.52 | (0.0) | -0.46 | (0.0) | -17 | (3.4) | 8 | (4.3) |
|  | Austria | 1.1 | (0.9) | 559 (14.5) | 548 (11.2) | 560 (11.4) | -45 (14.9) | 0.02 | (0.0) | 0.64 | (0.1) | -0.62 | (0.1) | -18 | (13.3) | 21 | (15.7) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w w | w w | w w | w w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 3.5 | (0.8) | 566 (10.1) | 566 (9.5) | 565 (9.9) | -54 (6.7) | 0.37 | (0.0) | 0.85 | (0.1) | -0.48 | (0.1) | -38 | (6.5) | -25 | (6.6) |
|  | Chile | 14.5 | (2.2) | 503 (6.6) | 511 (5.9) | 520 (6.4) | -53 (6.1) | -1.09 | (0.1) | -0.26 | (0.0) | -0.84 | (0.1) | -27 | (6.0) | -8 | (6.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.3 | (0.9) | c c | C C | c c | -6 (17.3) | -0.08 | (0.0) | 0.07 | (0.1) | -0.15 | (0.1) | 3 | (14.0) | 16 | (12.5) |
|  | Denmark | 4.2 | (1.5) | 527 (13.0) | 519 (14.5) | 526 (17.7) | -25 (6.4) | 0.35 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.0) | -0.34 | (0.1) | -11 | (5.0) | 0 | (4.6) |
|  | Estonia | 0.5 | (0.0) | C C | C C | C C | -9 (30.5) | 0.10 | (0.0) | 0.48 | (0.2) | -0.38 | (0.2) | 3 | (26.7) | 15 | (22.0) |
|  | Finland | 0.0 | c | c | c | c c | -24 (7.7) | 0.35 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.1) | -0.34 | (0.1) | -13 | (6.9) | -5 | (6.7) |
|  | France | 0.0 | c | C C | C C | c | -31 (7.4) | -0.11 | (0.0) | 0.28 | (0.0) | -0.38 | (0.0) | -8 | (6.6) | 26 | (7.9) |
|  | Germany | 0.5 | (0.4) | c | c | C C | -44 (19.7) | 0.15 | (0.0) | 0.65 | (0.2) | -0.51 | (0.2) | -17 | (16.0) | 23 | (15.7) |
|  | Greece | 2.3 | (0.7) | c c | c c | c c | c c | -0.12 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | c |
|  | Hungary | 0.0 | c | c | C C | C C | -15 (15.1) | -0.27 | (0.0) | -0.12 | (0.1) | -0.15 | (0.1) | -8 | (10.8) | 1 | (8.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | c | c | C | C | c c | 0.79 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | C |
|  | Ireland | 2.2 | (1.1) | c | C | c | -12 (5.0) | 0.03 | (0.0) | 0.13 | (0.0) | -0.10 | (0.0) | -8 | (4.1) | -4 | (3.7) |
|  | Israel | 0.0 | c | c c | c c | C C | c | 0.17 | (0.0) | C | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Italy | 2.9 | (0.5) | 515 (8.9) | 522 (9.3) | 526 (9.0) | 3 (7.7) | -0.07 | (0.0) | 0.23 | (0.1) | -0.30 | (0.1) | 12 | (6.1) | 31 | (7.8) |
|  | Japan | 29.9 | (1.2) | 540 (9.6) | 541 (9.3) | 544 (9.4) | -5 (10.3) | -0.15 | (0.0) | 0.12 | (0.0) | -0.28 | (0.0) | 6 | (8.7) | 43 | (6.7) |
|  | Korea | 15.9 | (3.1) | 609 (10.5) | 582 (8.9) | 579 (7.6) | -17 (10.1) | 0.00 | (0.0) | 0.03 | (0.0) | -0.04 | (0.1) | -15 | (8.4) | -12 | (6.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 1.8 | (0.0) | c c | c c | C C | 13 (2.7) | 0.06 | (0.0) | 0.12 | (0.0) | -0.06 | (0.0) | 15 | (3.0) | 18 | (2.8) |
|  | Mexico | 9.2 | (0.8) | 452 (6.0) | 466 (6.3) | 451 (4.7) | -43 (6.5) | -1.30 | (0.0) | 0.29 | (0.1) | -1.59 | (0.1) | -16 | (5.4) | 18 | (4.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.0 | c | C C | C C | C C | -7 (12.5) | 0.22 | (0.1) | 0.21 | (0.0) | 0.01 | (0.1) | -8 | (10.6) | -9 | (7.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.3 | (1.4) | 583 (6.8) | 593 (6.8) | 593 (6.2) | -87 (6.9) | 0.00 | (0.0) | 0.84 | (0.1) | -0.84 | (0.1) | -43 | (7.2) | 0 | (9.4) |
|  | Norway | 0.0 | c | c c | C C | c c | c c | 0.47 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c | C | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 1.0 | (0.2) | 581 (14.9) | 577 (14.3) | 583 (14.3) | -56 (12.9) | -0.24 | (0.0) | 0.77 | (0.1) | -1.01 | (0.1) | -15 | (11.3) | 15 | (12.9) |
|  | Portugal | 4.2 | (1.4) | 581 (5.2) | 572 (5.8) | 574 (8.4) | -62 (9.4) | -0.58 | (0.0) | 0.37 | (0.2) | -0.95 | (0.2) | -29 | (4.8) | -7 | (7.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.5 | (0.3) | C C | C C | c c | -42 (20.4) | -0.23 | (0.0) | 0.25 | (0.1) | -0.47 | (0.2) | -17 | (14.8) | 7 | (11.9) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.0 | c | c C | c C | c c | -87 (6.9) | 0.07 | (0.0) | 0.74 | (0.1) | -0.67 | (0.1) | -60 | (7.4) | -3 | (7.0) |
|  | Spain | 7.4 | (1.0) | 523 (4.8) | 528 (5.2) | 530 (3.7) | -39 (3.3) | -0.39 | (0.0) | 0.20 | (0.1) | -0.59 | (0.1) | -21 | (3.3) | -10 | (4.1) |
|  | Sweden | 0.0 | c | C C | C C | c c | -15 (8.4) | 0.24 | (0.0) | 0.48 | (0.1) | -0.24 | (0.1) | -7 | (6.4) | 2 | (5.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 4.8 | (1.0) | 505 (13.0) | 493 (10.2) | 509 (9.8) | 12 (14.8) | 0.13 | (0.0) | 0.71 | (0.1) | -0.57 | (0.1) | 34 | (14.3) | 71 | (15.5) |
|  | Turkey | 0.0 | c | C C | C C | C C | c c | -1.48 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | c |
|  | United Kingdom | 7.8 | (0.7) | 569 (12.7) | 577 (11.7) | 592 (11.0) | -23 (8.1) | 0.18 | (0.0) | 0.40 | (0.0) | -0.21 | (0.0) | -13 | (5.9) | -1 | (5.2) |
|  | United States | 5.1 | (0.9) | 496 (10.0) | 527 (13.1) | 518 (13.8) | -14 (11.4) | 0.15 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.1) | -0.58 | (0.1) | 7 | (8.1) | 27 | (6.4) |
|  | OECD average | 4.1 | (0.2) | 542 (2.5) | 543 (2.4) | 547 (2.5) | -28 (2.1) | -0.07 | (0.0) | 0.39 | (0.0) | -0.46 | (0.0) | -12 | (1.7) | 7 | (1.6) |


| Albania |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Argentina |  |
|  | Brazil |
|  | Colombia |
| Costa Rica |  |
| Croatia |  |
| Hong Kong-China |  |
| Indonesia |  |
| Jordan |  |
| Kazakhstan |  |
| Latvia |  |
| Liechtenstein |  |
| Lithuania |  |
| Macao-China |  |
| Malaysia |  |
| Montenegro |  |
| Peru |  |
| Qatar |  |
| Romania |  |
| Russian Federation |  |
| Serbia |  |
| Shanghai-China |  |
| Singapore |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  |
| Thailand |  |
| Tunisia |  |
| United Arab Emirates |  |
| Uruguay |  |
|  | Viet Nam |


| 8.3 | (2.1) | 403 (6.4) | 392 (15.1) | 402 (12.0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.7 | (2.2) | 428 (14.3) | 442 (12.9) | 443 (19.0) |
| 12.8 | (1.3) | 461 (6.9) | 479 (6.1) | 471 (6.2) |
| 1.2 | (0.9) | c | c | c c |
| 10.1 | (1.4) | 441 (12.7) | 476 (12.2) | 455 (13.0) |
| 9.5 | (1.5) | 478 (9.5) | 510 (9.8) | 496 (9.3) |
| 0.9 | (0.7) | c c | c c | c c |
| 16.1 | (0.0) | 486 (2.5) | 472 (3.1) | 477 (3.2) |
| 1.2 | (0.7) | c c | c | c c |
| 23.7 | (2.7) | 395 (10.7) | 413 (8.8) | 394 (8.8) |
| 15.8 | (1.2) | 440 (10.8) | 447 (10.4) | 457 (9.9) |
| 2.1 | (0.9) | 436 (14.7) | 412 (9.5) | 442 (14.0) |
| 1.9 | (1.3) | c c | c c | c c |
| 6.4 | (0.4) | C C | C | c c |
| 0.4 | (0.4) | c c | c c | c c |
| 14.5 | (0.0) | 559 (2.9) | 523 (2.5) | 534 (2.5) |
| 3.4 | (0.7) | 505 (27.3) | 432 (36.7) | 465 (31.6) |
| 0.4 | (0.0) | C | c | C |
| 14.7 | (1.8) | 424 (11.3) | 437 (11.4) | 419 (9.5) |
| 37.2 | (0.1) | 442 (1.3) | 447 (1.5) | 451 (1.4) |
| 0.6 | (0.6) | c | c | C C |
| 0.6 | (0.6) | C C | c | C C |
| 0.4 | (0.4) | C C | c c | C C |
| 9.3 | (1.8) | 644 (9.3) | 599 (9.3) | 600 (8.5) |
| 2.4 | (0.7) | c | c c | c c |
| 27.9 | (1.9) | 529 (7.9) | 501 (7.4) | 501 (5.5) |
| 4.9 | (1.3) | 398 (23.2) | 417 (25.1) | 410 (22.0) |
| 0.6 | (0.4) | c c | c c | c c |
| 44.9 | (1.7) | 461 (4.3) | 464 (4.6) | 469 (5.3) |
| 16.7 | (1.2) | 492 (6.6) | 497 (6.8) | 501 (6.9) |
| 7.4 | (1.1) | 499 (11.6) | 493 (7.6) | 515 (11.1) |



| (6) | c | c | C | c | c | c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3) | -0.95 | (0.0) | -0.30 | (0.1) | -0.65 | (0.1) |  |
| (7) | -1.42 | (0.0) | -0.03 | (0.1) | -1.39 | (0.1) |  |
| c | -0.29 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c |  |
| 0) | -1.42 | (0.0) | -0.44 | (0.1) | -0.99 | (0.1) |  |
| 6) | -1.22 | (0.0) | 0.38 | (0.1) | -1.61 | (0.1) |  |
| C | -0.35 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c |  |
| 9) | -0.04 | (0.0) | 0.69 | (0.0) | -0.72 | (0.0) |  |
| () | -0.77 | (0.1) | -0.79 | (0.1) | 0.02 | (0.1) |  |
| (1) | -1.78 | (0.1) | -1.81 | (0.1) | 0.03 | (0.1) |  |
| (8) | -0.51 | (0.0) | 0.04 | (0.1) | -0.55 | (0.1) |  |
| 4) | -0.32 | (0.0) | -0.16 | (0.1) | -0.16 | (0.1) |  |
| c | -0.27 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c |  |
| c | 0.27 | (0.1) | c | c | C | c |  |
| c | -0.15 | (0.0) | C | c | c | c |  |
| c | c | c | -0.87 | (0.0) | c | c |  |
| 8) | -0.75 | (0.0) | 0.04 | (0.2) | -0.79 | (0.2) |  |
| c | -0.25 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c |  |
| 0) | -1.52 | (0.0) | -0.31 | (0.1) | -1.21 | (0.1) |  |
| 7) | 0.32 | (0.0) | 0.62 | (0.0) | -0.30 | (0.0) | -1 |
| c | -0.48 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c |  |
| C | -0.11 | (0.0) | C | C | c | c |  |
| c | -0.31 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c |  |
| 1) | -0.40 | (0.0) | 0.05 | (0.1) | -0.45 | (0.1) |  |
| c | -0.28 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c |  |
| 3) | -0.36 | (0.0) | -0.47 | (0.0) | 0.12 | (0.1) |  |
| 9) | -1.37 | (0.0) | -1.23 | (0.1) | -0.14 | (0.2) |  |
| c | -1.20 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c |  |
| 9) | 0.05 | (0.0) | 0.56 | (0.0) | -0.51 | (0.0) |  |
| 1) | -1.15 | (0.0) | 0.46 | (0.1) | -1.61 | (0.1) |  |
| 4) | -1.86 | (0.0) | -1.15 | (0.2) | -0.71 | (0.2) |  |


| c | c | c | c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -45 | (6.3) | -27 | (8.3) |
| -60 | (6.0) | -19 | (7.1) |
| c | c | c | c |
| -28 | (9.0) | -7 | (8.2) |
| -48 | (8.4) | -10 | (10.8) |
| C | c | c | c |
| -31 | (3.3) | 16 | (3.7) |
| 34 | (10.0) | 33 | (12.0) |
| 4 | (7.6) | 4 | (6.8) |
| -48 | (9.7) | -33 | (8.4) |
| 2 | (11.3) | 8 | (10.6) |
| c | c | c | c |
| C | c | C | C |
| C | c | C | C |
| c | c | C | C |
| -65 | (23.2) | -39 | (18.9) |
| C | c | c | C |
| -42 | (9.0) | -7 | (7.4) |
| -102 | (1.7) | -93 | (1.6) |
| c | c | c | c |
| C | c | C | C |
| C | C | C | C |
| -16 | (7.7) | 10 | (9.4) |
| C | c | c | c |
| 54 | (5.0) | 44 | (4.4) |
| 39 | (6.4) | 42 | (5.2) |
| c | c | c | c |
| -50 | (4.5) | -28 | (4.4) |
| -55 | (5.9) | 28 | (8.8) |
| 36 | (12.9) | 58 | (16.3) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Make sure that professional development activities for teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 12.9 | (1.3) | 35.8 | (1.7) | 34.7 | (1.9) | 16.5 | (1.5) | 5.9 | (1.0) | 20.1 | (1.7) | 48.5 | (1.7) | 25.5 | (1.5) |
|  | Austria | 31.2 | (3.5) | 22.4 | (3.4) | 37.3 | (3.3) | 9.1 | (2.4) | 28.1 | (3.7) | 35.4 | (4.3) | 29.0 | (3.6) | 7.5 | (2.2) |
|  | Belgium | 63.1 | (3.0) | 24.7 | (2.7) | 9.1 | (1.8) | 3.1 | (1.0) | 26.6 | (2.6) | 30.9 | (2.9) | 29.9 | (3.0) | 12.7 | (2.3) |
|  | Canada | 22.3 | (1.6) | 42.8 | (2.3) | 28.9 | (2.1) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 14.0 | (1.6) | 32.2 | (2.4) | 42.0 | (2.4) | 11.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Chile | 27.1 | (3.5) | 22.9 | (3.3) | 37.3 | (3.8) | 12.7 | (2.6) | 17.6 | (3.2) | 14.6 | (2.8) | 52.0 | (3.7) | 15.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | 19.3 | (3.0) | 44.7 | (3.8) | 28.8 | (3.4) | 7.3 | (2.0) | 21.0 | (3.0) | 36.3 | (3.7) | 36.1 | (4.0) | 6.6 | (1.9) |
|  | Denmark | 47.0 | (3.6) | 25.1 | (3.3) | 22.9 | (2.8) | 4.9 | (1.5) | 38.2 | (3.6) | 26.9 | (3.0) | 29.5 | (3.1) | 5.3 | (1.5) |
|  | Estonia | 27.3 | (2.7) | 32.1 | (3.0) | 31.5 | (2.9) | 9.1 | (2.1) | 31.5 | (3.0) | 25.6 | (2.7) | 37.3 | (2.9) | 5.5 | (1.5) |
|  | Finland | 51.7 | (3.3) | 31.0 | (3.1) | 14.3 | (2.5) | 3.0 | (0.8) | 42.3 | (2.9) | 29.6 | (3.0) | 20.6 | (2.8) | 7.6 | (1.8) |
|  | France | 30.0 | (3.1) | 48.5 | (3.2) | 13.8 | (2.6) | 7.7 | (1.7) | 54.2 | (3.7) | 29.7 | (3.2) | 10.5 | (2.2) | 5.6 | (1.7) |
|  | Germany | 25.1 | (3.2) | 35.0 | (3.5) | 33.2 | (3.5) | 6.7 | (1.7) | 24.4 | (3.2) | 31.0 | (3.4) | 42.6 | (3.5) | 2.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Greece | 47.9 | (3.9) | 28.3 | (4.0) | 13.8 | (2.8) | 10.0 | (1.9) | 43.5 | (3.8) | 30.7 | (3.7) | 20.8 | (3.4) | 5.0 | (1.4) |
|  | Hungary | 26.8 | (3.0) | 34.5 | (3.8) | 29.4 | (3.4) | 9.3 | (2.2) | 27.5 | (3.9) | 23.0 | (3.0) | 41.1 | (3.7) | 8.5 | (2.0) |
|  | Iceland | 26.9 | (0.2) | 47.9 | (0.2) | 21.0 | (0.2) | 4.3 | (0.1) | 29.0 | (0.2) | 30.5 | (0.2) | 31.9 | (0.2) | 8.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 33.7 | (4.2) | 42.4 | (4.1) | 17.1 | (3.1) | 6.9 | (2.0) | 25.3 | (3.5) | 30.2 | (3.4) | 32.5 | (3.6) | 12.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Israel | 16.8 | (2.9) | 30.8 | (3.5) | 42.8 | (4.3) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 28.2 | (3.6) | 34.3 | (3.9) | 29.9 | (3.8) | 7.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Italy | 28.9 | (1.6) | 30.7 | (2.0) | 23.6 | (1.6) | 16.8 | (1.6) | 20.5 | (1.7) | 30.2 | (2.0) | 30.6 | (2.1) | 18.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Japan | 80.4 | (2.7) | 16.4 | (2.6) | 2.7 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 55.9 | (3.5) | 34.4 | (3.3) | 8.0 | (2.0) | 1.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Korea | 24.2 | (3.3) | 52.6 | (4.2) | 18.7 | (3.3) | 4.5 | (1.4) | 26.0 | (3.3) | 38.2 | (3.7) | 29.9 | (4.0) | 5.8 | (2.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 57.2 | (0.1) | 30.1 | (0.1) | 12.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 31.2 | (0.1) | 53.0 | (0.1) | 14.4 | (0.1) | 1.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 21.0 | (1.6) | 38.5 | (1.9) | 28.7 | (1.7) | 11.8 | (1.3) | 26.3 | (1.8) | 34.6 | (1.9) | 28.0 | (1.6) | 11.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 20.5 | (3.1) | 35.5 | (4.2) | 35.4 | (4.0) | 8.5 | (2.2) | 22.4 | (3.4) | 33.5 | (4.0) | 34.3 | (3.7) | 9.9 | (2.7) |
|  | New Zealand | 26.4 | (3.5) | 36.0 | (4.0) | 25.6 | (3.1) | 12.1 | (2.8) | 10.3 | (2.2) | 31.9 | (3.8) | 42.9 | (4.7) | 14.8 | (3.1) |
|  | Norway | 23.6 | (3.1) | 29.7 | (3.3) | 36.5 | (3.7) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 30.6 | (3.3) | 34.2 | (3.7) | 10.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Poland | 51.9 | (3.6) | 29.5 | (2.9) | 12.4 | (2.7) | 6.2 | (1.7) | 76.0 | (3.5) | 16.0 | (3.1) | 7.7 | (2.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 17.6 | (3.4) | 33.1 | (4.2) | 26.0 | (3.5) | 23.4 | (3.4) | 41.1 | (4.6) | 33.5 | (4.1) | 16.2 | (2.8) | 9.2 | (2.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 25.9 | (3.6) | 42.2 | (4.5) | 24.6 | (3.3) | 7.2 | (1.9) | 30.2 | (3.5) | 25.1 | (3.5) | 36.7 | (3.6) | 8.0 | (1.8) |
|  | Slovenia | 33.1 | (0.8) | 30.0 | (0.8) | 30.6 | (0.5) | 6.3 | (0.2) | 12.9 | (0.6) | 24.9 | (0.5) | 44.4 | (0.7) | 17.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Spain | 43.0 | (2.5) | 44.5 | (2.8) | 8.3 | (1.2) | 4.2 | (1.3) | 51.7 | (2.8) | 31.2 | (2.4) | 12.7 | (1.8) | 4.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Sweden | 14.5 | (2.6) | 31.7 | (3.5) | 46.3 | (3.6) | 7.6 | (1.8) | 33.2 | (3.8) | 30.2 | (3.4) | 28.0 | (3.4) | 8.6 | (1.8) |
|  | Switzerland | 68.3 | (3.4) | 21.7 | (3.4) | 8.6 | (1.8) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 57.7 | (3.3) | 26.5 | (3.0) | 14.3 | (2.6) | 1.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Turkey | 13.1 | (2.5) | 29.1 | (3.4) | 42.6 | (3.6) | 15.2 | (2.8) | 35.5 | (4.0) | 21.3 | (3.4) | 28.5 | (4.0) | 14.7 | (3.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 9.6 | (2.0) | 20.3 | (2.4) | 39.3 | (3.4) | 30.8 | (3.4) | 11.5 | (2.2) | 19.9 | (2.3) | 43.6 | (3.7) | 25.0 | (3.3) |
|  | United States | 10.0 | (2.4) | 24.0 | (3.7) | 44.6 | (4.9) | 21.4 | (3.9) | 7.2 | (2.1) | 18.5 | (3.8) | 52.9 | (4.0) | 21.3 | (3.7) |
|  | OECD average | 31.7 | (0.5) | 33.1 | (0.5) | 26.0 | (0.5) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 30.4 | (0.5) | 29.3 | (0.5) | 30.6 | (0.5) | 9.8 | (0.3) |


| $\cdots$ Albania | 25.2 | (3.3) | 18.6 | (3.2) | 39.8 | (3.5) | 16.3 | (3.2) | 5.3 | (1.8) | 15.7 | (2.7) | 53.1 | (4.1) | 25.9 | (3.6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 30.2 | (3.3) | 37.4 | (3.6) | 21.3 | (3.6) | 11.1 | (2.7) | 28.5 | (3.8) | 28.9 | (3.5) | 30.0 | (3.8) | 12.6 | (2.9) |
| © Brazil | 17.6 | (2.3) | 33.3 | (2.7) | 27.6 | (2.4) | 21.5 | (2.2) | 2.8 | (0.7) | 10.5 | (1.6) | 29.3 | (2.3) | 57.4 | (2.3) |
| Bulgaria | 33.0 | (3.8) | 36.0 | (3.6) | 19.4 | (2.8) | 11.6 | (2.6) | 14.7 | (2.7) | 38.7 | (3.7) | 31.7 | (3.3) | 14.9 | (2.5) |
| Colombia | 19.3 | (2.9) | 41.0 | (4.0) | 20.7 | (3.6) | 19.1 | (3.1) | 27.7 | (3.2) | 26.4 | (3.4) | 34.0 | (3.1) | 11.9 | (3.0) |
| Costa Rica | 31.6 | (3.6) | 44.9 | (3.9) | 15.7 | (2.7) | 7.8 | (1.8) | 29.7 | (3.3) | 30.3 | (3.5) | 28.1 | (3.5) | 12.0 | (2.2) |
| Croatia | 25.1 | (3.5) | 38.9 | (4.0) | 23.4 | (3.2) | 12.6 | (2.6) | 21.9 | (3.3) | 32.2 | (3.9) | 36.2 | (3.6) | 9.7 | (2.3) |
| Cyprus* | 14.9 | (0.1) | 32.0 | (0.1) | 24.7 | (0.1) | 28.4 | (0.1) | 12.9 | (0.1) | 27.3 | (0.1) | 34.7 | (0.1) | 25.0 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 33.4 | (4.1) | 42.3 | (3.5) | 20.3 | (3.8) | 4.0 | (1.3) | 17.4 | (3.0) | 57.3 | (4.3) | 21.2 | (3.7) | 4.2 | (1.7) |
| Indonesia | 26.9 | (3.7) | 33.6 | (3.6) | 24.6 | (3.6) | 14.9 | (2.9) | 19.4 | (2.7) | 28.4 | (4.0) | 36.9 | (3.8) | 15.3 | (2.6) |
| Jordan | 18.9 | (2.9) | 19.6 | (2.9) | 43.5 | (3.5) | 18.0 | (3.2) | 24.1 | (3.4) | 15.9 | (2.7) | 40.1 | (3.7) | 19.9 | (3.3) |
| Kazakhstan | 3.8 | (1.2) | 26.6 | (3.5) | 39.5 | (4.0) | 30.1 | (3.6) | 5.4 | (1.4) | 10.4 | (2.3) | 40.8 | (4.0) | 43.3 | (3.8) |
| Latvia | 27.9 | (3.5) | 33.8 | (3.6) | 24.7 | (3.3) | 13.6 | (2.3) | 21.0 | (3.0) | 34.9 | (3.3) | 28.3 | (3.3) | 15.8 | (2.6) |
| Liechtenstein | 68.2 | (0.8) | 17.5 | (0.5) | 8.9 | (1.0) | 5.4 | (0.7) | 44.9 | (0.9) | 34.1 | (0.4) | 15.7 | (0.9) | 5.4 | (0.7) |
| Lithuania | 72.8 | (2.9) | 19.5 | (2.6) | 6.2 | (1.7) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 35.2 | (3.0) | 24.9 | (3.0) | 34.5 | (3.2) | 5.4 | (1.7) |
| Macao-China | 41.6 | (0.1) | 48.6 | (0.1) | 8.7 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 19.2 | (0.0) | 53.0 | (0.1) | 24.2 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 5.3 | (1.8) | 39.0 | (4.0) | 27.3 | (3.7) | 28.5 | (3.4) | 4.0 | (1.6) | 29.9 | (3.6) | 38.8 | (3.8) | 27.4 | (3.3) |
| Montenegro | 10.3 | (0.1) | 45.4 | (0.2) | 25.1 | (0.1) | 19.2 | (0.1) | 19.9 | (0.1) | 19.1 | (0.1) | 41.0 | (0.1) | 20.0 | (0.1) |
| Peru | 38.7 | (3.1) | 34.0 | (3.0) | 18.7 | (2.6) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 30.0 | (3.5) | 30.9 | (3.4) | 26.2 | (3.2) | 12.9 | (2.4) |
| Qatar | 9.8 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.1) | 32.6 | (0.1) | 25.0 | (0.1) | 10.1 | (0.1) | 25.0 | (0.1) | 32.8 | (0.1) | 32.0 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 62.8 | (3.3) | 15.7 | (2.4) | 13.9 | (2.7) | 7.6 | (2.2) | 60.9 | (3.2) | 20.2 | (3.0) | 11.2 | (2.4) | 7.7 | (1.8) |
| Russian Federation | 42.7 | (3.2) | 26.8 | (2.9) | 19.6 | (2.5) | 10.9 | (2.3) | 10.9 | (2.1) | 25.0 | (2.9) | 50.6 | (3.6) | 13.6 | (2.5) |
| Serbia | 22.9 | (3.4) | 33.9 | (4.4) | 28.7 | (3.5) | 14.6 | (3.1) | 16.7 | (2.9) | 28.5 | (3.8) | 32.7 | (3.5) | 22.1 | (3.7) |
| Shanghai-China | 75.1 | (3.6) | 16.9 | (3.1) | 7.3 | (2.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 21.8 | (3.2) | 40.8 | (3.9) | 33.2 | (3.6) | 4.3 | (1.7) |
| Singapore | 13.1 | (0.6) | 52.3 | (0.5) | 21.6 | (0.5) | 13.0 | (0.1) | 13.6 | (0.6) | 35.6 | (0.5) | 34.5 | (0.6) | 16.3 | (0.2) |
| Chinese Taipei | 34.7 | (3.6) | 22.8 | (3.1) | 25.3 | (3.6) | 17.2 | (3.1) | 12.8 | (2.6) | 36.2 | (3.8) | 34.8 | (3.9) | 16.2 | (3.0) |
| Thailand | 27.8 | (2.8) | 26.9 | (3.2) | 26.0 | (3.3) | 19.3 | (3.1) | 19.8 | (3.0) | 28.8 | (3.3) | 36.3 | (3.0) | 15.1 | (3.1) |
| Tunisia | 44.6 | (4.3) | 49.1 | (4.2) | 2.9 | (1.4) | 3.5 | (1.5) | 64.4 | (3.6) | 19.3 | (3.5) | 11.4 | (2.5) | 4.9 | (1.9) |
| United Arab Emirates | 11.2 | (1.6) | 37.8 | (2.6) | 32.5 | (2.5) | 18.5 | (2.0) | 10.6 | (1.9) | 26.3 | (2.5) | 43.5 | (2.8) | 19.5 | (2.1) |
| Uruguay | 27.4 | (3.3) | 31.9 | (3.4) | 28.1 | (3.0) | 12.6 | (2.5) | 30.7 | (3.4) | 16.8 | (2.9) | 34.5 | (3.9) | 18.0 | (3.0) |
| Viet Nam | 45.0 | (4.2) | 32.5 | (3.9) | 19.4 | (3.2) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 31.1 | (4.2) | 34.8 | (3.7) | 33.3 | (3.9) | 0.7 | (0.7) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals'reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ensure that teachers work according to the school's educational goals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 4.8 | (0.8) | 18.2 | (1.6) | 41.1 | (1.8) | 35.8 | (1.8) | 12.3 | (1.3) | 19.2 | (1.6) | 62.4 | (2.0) | 6.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Austria | 19.7 | (3.3) | 28.3 | (3.1) | 40.7 | (4.1) | 11.3 | (2.8) | 21.3 | (3.8) | 55.6 | (4.2) | 22.0 | (2.7) | 1.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Belgium | 19.7 | (2.6) | 27.6 | (2.6) | 30.7 | (3.0) | 21.9 | (2.6) | 35.2 | (3.4) | 41.6 | (3.3) | 18.5 | (2.6) | 4.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Canada | 9.1 | (1.4) | 21.1 | (2.1) | 42.5 | (2.4) | 27.3 | (2.3) | 5.7 | (1.0) | 13.8 | (1.4) | 75.1 | (2.0) | 5.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Chile | 3.9 | (1.4) | 19.1 | (2.8) | 58.1 | (3.7) | 18.9 | (3.1) | 10.3 | (2.6) | 18.2 | (2.9) | 60.9 | (3.2) | 10.6 | (2.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 9.0 | (2.3) | 30.8 | (3.3) | 45.8 | (3.6) | 14.4 | (3.2) | 14.3 | (2.8) | 52.4 | (4.1) | 33.1 | (3.7) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Denmark | 38.1 | (3.7) | 26.8 | (3.8) | 28.7 | (3.3) | 6.4 | (1.5) | 27.2 | (3.2) | 35.5 | (3.8) | 35.2 | (3.3) | 2.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Estonia | 17.5 | (2.5) | 22.8 | (2.6) | 42.2 | (2.6) | 17.5 | (2.7) | 24.9 | (2.7) | 42.8 | (3.0) | 30.9 | (2.7) | 1.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Finland | 32.7 | (3.0) | 32.5 | (3.4) | 24.0 | (2.9) | 10.8 | (2.1) | 22.1 | (3.2) | 25.2 | (3.0) | 50.0 | (3.8) | 2.6 | (1.4) |
|  | France | 17.8 | (2.5) | 40.7 | (3.3) | 26.9 | (3.1) | 14.6 | (2.6) | 9.5 | (2.1) | 57.5 | (3.5) | 27.8 | (2.9) | 5.2 | (1.7) |
|  | Germany | 18.6 | (3.2) | 28.2 | (3.4) | 44.8 | (3.4) | 8.4 | (2.2) | 28.0 | (3.7) | 40.5 | (3.7) | 28.8 | (3.4) | 2.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Greece | 17.8 | (3.1) | 14.7 | (2.5) | 47.3 | (4.1) | 20.2 | (3.1) | 16.6 | (2.7) | 45.9 | (3.9) | 29.7 | (3.8) | 7.9 | (2.0) |
|  | Hungary | 1.2 | (0.7) | 9.4 | (2.3) | 48.9 | (3.7) | 40.6 | (3.6) | 36.3 | (3.7) | 34.5 | (4.3) | 27.5 | (3.7) | 1.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Iceland | 32.5 | (0.2) | 30.4 | (0.2) | 28.2 | (0.2) | 9.0 | (0.1) | 3.9 | (0.1) | 29.2 | (0.2) | 63.8 | (0.2) | 3.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 15.4 | (3.3) | 28.1 | (3.7) | 27.9 | (3.5) | 28.6 | (3.7) | 32.7 | (3.9) | 39.7 | (3.9) | 20.5 | (3.2) | 7.1 | (1.9) |
|  | Israel | 6.2 | (1.9) | 34.4 | (3.6) | 45.1 | (4.3) | 14.2 | (3.0) | 11.5 | (2.5) | 31.4 | (3.6) | 51.0 | (3.9) | 6.1 | (1.9) |
|  | Italy | 7.7 | (1.2) | 27.2 | (1.9) | 37.7 | (2.1) | 27.4 | (2.0) | 7.3 | (1.4) | 56.0 | (2.2) | 25.5 | (1.8) | 11.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Japan | 45.6 | (3.9) | 38.2 | (3.6) | 11.4 | (2.0) | 4.7 | (1.6) | 44.3 | (4.0) | 30.3 | (3.5) | 23.8 | (3.3) | 1.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Korea | 33.7 | (3.7) | 31.8 | (3.9) | 29.5 | (3.7) | 5.1 | (1.8) | 22.4 | (3.4) | 12.9 | (2.8) | 60.2 | (3.9) | 4.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 14.9 | (0.1) | 26.0 | (0.1) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 26.6 | (0.1) | 20.2 | (0.1) | 36.3 | (0.1) | 35.3 | (0.1) | 8.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 9.4 | (1.1) | 26.5 | (2.0) | 45.9 | (2.2) | 18.2 | (1.4) | 14.4 | (1.2) | 36.4 | (2.0) | 41.4 | (1.9) | 7.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Netherlands | 16.7 | (3.2) | 24.5 | (4.1) | 40.3 | (4.0) | 18.5 | (3.4) | 50.8 | (4.2) | 33.1 | (4.3) | 14.6 | (2.7) | 1.5 | (1.1) |
|  | New Zealand | 14.7 | (2.8) | 31.8 | (4.2) | 38.6 | (4.3) | 14.9 | (3.2) | 11.2 | (2.6) | 29.8 | (4.3) | 56.8 | (4.7) | 2.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Norway | 11.8 | (2.2) | 32.3 | (3.2) | 41.7 | (3.3) | 14.2 | (2.5) | 5.6 | (1.9) | 29.0 | (3.7) | 63.6 | (3.8) | 1.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Poland | 21.2 | (3.1) | 40.9 | (3.6) | 34.3 | (3.7) | 3.6 | (1.6) | 15.4 | (2.9) | 63.0 | (3.8) | 20.1 | (3.2) | 1.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Portugal | 13.3 | (2.7) | 26.4 | (4.2) | 33.6 | (3.7) | 26.7 | (3.8) | 1.7 | (0.8) | 10.7 | (2.8) | 81.7 | (3.3) | 5.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 10.6 | (2.4) | 15.4 | (3.2) | 50.1 | (4.2) | 23.9 | (3.0) | 1.9 | (1.2) | 36.3 | (3.2) | 61.8 | (3.1) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Slovenia | 10.2 | (0.4) | 12.1 | (0.4) | 47.3 | (0.8) | 30.4 | (0.7) | 6.4 | (0.4) | 25.5 | (0.8) | 63.9 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Spain | 11.4 | (1.9) | 35.3 | (2.2) | 38.7 | (2.8) | 14.6 | (2.2) | 6.7 | (1.0) | 64.2 | (2.6) | 24.8 | (2.3) | 4.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Sweden | 13.2 | (2.6) | 29.2 | (3.2) | 43.1 | (3.7) | 14.6 | (2.6) | 8.7 | (2.0) | 26.1 | (3.3) | 59.9 | (3.7) | 5.3 | (1.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 48.0 | (3.1) | 24.7 | (3.2) | 21.7 | (2.7) | 5.6 | (1.4) | 47.8 | (3.5) | 35.4 | (3.6) | 14.9 | (2.2) | 2.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Turkey | 10.9 | (2.4) | 11.0 | (2.8) | 38.3 | (4.1) | 39.9 | (4.0) | 9.7 | (2.4) | 51.9 | (3.6) | 18.5 | (3.4) | 20.0 | (2.8) |
|  | United Kingdom | 2.9 | (0.9) | 12.7 | (2.0) | 34.5 | (2.9) | 49.9 | (3.1) | 6.8 | (1.5) | 24.8 | (2.6) | 54.2 | (3.5) | 14.2 | (2.3) |
|  | United States | 5.6 | (1.9) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 41.2 | (4.4) | 50.2 | (4.5) | 7.7 | (2.3) | 9.2 | (2.1) | 74.3 | (3.9) | 8.9 | (2.3) |
|  | OECD average | 16.6 | (0.4) | 25.4 | (0.5) | 37.7 | (0.6) | 20.3 | (0.5) | 17.7 | (0.4) | 35.1 | (0.5) | 42.1 | (0.5) | 5.1 | (0.3) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 1.2 | (0.4) | 9.3 | (2.4) | 58.0 | (3.4) | 31.5 | (3.6) | 22.7 | (3.4) | 27.6 | (3.6) | 44.2 | (4.5) | 5.5 | (1.8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | Argentina | 9.7 | (2.2) | 31.0 | (3.8) | 36.3 | (3.9) | 23.0 | (4.0) | 19.5 | (2.9) | 42.6 | (3.9) | 27.0 | (3.7) | 10.9 | (2.4) |
| ส | Brazil | 2.2 | (0.5) | 8.7 | (1.4) | 28.4 | (2.6) | 60.7 | (2.5) | 4.4 | (1.1) | 21.0 | (2.0) | 52.9 | (2.4) | 21.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Bulgaria | 3.3 | (1.4) | 4.3 | (1.6) | 42.8 | (4.2) | 49.5 | (4.0) | 7.8 | (1.9) | 26.5 | (3.6) | 62.0 | (3.9) | 3.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Colombia | 23.0 | (2.8) | 27.9 | (3.4) | 31.6 | (3.4) | 17.5 | (3.4) | 10.7 | (2.8) | 30.6 | (3.5) | 43.3 | (3.9) | 15.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Costa Rica | 11.7 | (2.3) | 31.8 | (3.7) | 37.7 | (3.8) | 18.7 | (3.0) | 11.1 | (2.2) | 20.5 | (3.3) | 57.5 | (3.6) | 10.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Croatia | 13.1 | (2.5) | 25.2 | (3.2) | 43.8 | (3.7) | 17.9 | (2.9) | 7.1 | (1.9) | 24.2 | (3.4) | 65.3 | (3.7) | 3.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 6.3 | (0.0) | 6.7 | (0.1) | 37.8 | (0.1) | 49.2 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.0) | 34.0 | (0.1) | 55.0 | (0.1) | 7.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 21.1 | (3.1) | 26.9 | (3.7) | 41.2 | (4.1) | 10.7 | (2.3) | 29.7 | (3.6) | 41.4 | (4.2) | 28.8 | (3.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 6.4 | (1.7) | 26.3 | (3.6) | 46.9 | (3.8) | 20.3 | (3.0) | 7.4 | (2.3) | 29.3 | (3.9) | 56.5 | (4.3) | 6.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Jordan | 3.8 | (1.4) | 8.1 | (2.0) | 53.9 | (3.5) | 34.2 | (3.6) | 13.9 | (2.9) | 12.0 | (2.6) | 51.5 | (3.8) | 22.5 | (2.9) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 3.0 | (1.3) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 19.7 | (3.2) | 68.9 | (3.9) | 4.0 | (1.5) | 31.1 | (3.7) | 62.5 | (3.8) | 2.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Latvia | 10.3 | (2.2) | 17.4 | (3.0) | 29.1 | (3.3) | 43.2 | (3.3) | 29.5 | (3.3) | 28.8 | (3.3) | 37.9 | (3.6) | 3.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 43.9 | (0.8) | 35.1 | (0.9) | 15.7 | (0.9) | 5.4 | (0.7) | 57.3 | (0.9) | 24.5 | (0.9) | 18.2 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Lithuania | 10.9 | (2.3) | 17.8 | (2.8) | 44.8 | (3.3) | 26.5 | (3.0) | 17.5 | (2.8) | 53.4 | (3.2) | 28.6 | (3.2) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 14.6 | (0.0) | 49.5 | (0.1) | 23.6 | (0.1) | 12.4 | (0.0) | 16.8 | (0.0) | 40.5 | (0.1) | 38.5 | (0.1) | 4.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 0.9 | (0.9) | 13.7 | (2.7) | 39.9 | (3.9) | 45.5 | (4.3) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 28.5 | (4.0) | 47.7 | (4.4) | 22.4 | (3.2) |
|  | Montenegro | 10.1 | (0.1) | 12.5 | (0.1) | 45.2 | (0.2) | 32.2 | (0.2) | 5.8 | (0.1) | 41.7 | (0.2) | 37.1 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 18.3 | (3.0) | 29.0 | (3.0) | 32.7 | (3.6) | 20.1 | (2.8) | 18.2 | (2.6) | 42.2 | (3.8) | 34.6 | (3.6) | 5.0 | (1.6) |
|  | Qatar | 3.0 | (0.0) | 11.4 | (0.1) | 36.2 | (0.1) | 49.4 | (0.1) | 3.3 | (0.0) | 15.1 | (0.1) | 59.8 | (0.1) | 21.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 40.5 | (2.8) | 9.7 | (1.9) | 24.2 | (2.6) | 25.6 | (2.8) | 47.3 | (3.2) | 12.0 | (2.4) | 32.8 | (3.4) | 7.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 2.9 | (1.1) | 10.5 | (2.7) | 52.5 | (3.3) | 34.1 | (3.3) | 11.7 | (2.1) | 38.4 | (3.8) | 48.1 | (3.9) | 1.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Serbia | 4.8 | (1.5) | 14.2 | (3.1) | 35.3 | (4.0) | 45.6 | (4.3) | 17.0 | (3.3) | 41.3 | (3.4) | 37.3 | (3.8) | 4.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 11.7 | (2.4) | 29.3 | (3.3) | 54.7 | (3.9) | 4.4 | (1.8) | 24.1 | (3.0) | 36.6 | (4.0) | 37.4 | (3.8) | 1.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Singapore | 6.1 | (0.6) | 29.4 | (0.3) | 33.2 | (0.7) | 31.2 | (0.3) | 8.9 | (0.6) | 30.1 | (0.5) | 57.4 | (0.5) | 3.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 17.8 | (3.2) | 29.6 | (3.8) | 34.6 | (3.8) | 17.9 | (3.1) | 29.6 | (3.8) | 41.3 | (3.9) | 22.6 | (3.5) | 6.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Thailand | 14.8 | (2.4) | 23.3 | (3.0) | 44.0 | (3.2) | 18.0 | (3.1) | 6.6 | (1.9) | 7.8 | (1.7) | 73.7 | (3.8) | 11.9 | (2.6) |
|  | Tunisia | 26.2 | (3.7) | 32.0 | (3.8) | 21.6 | (3.5) | 20.2 | (3.5) | 27.9 | (3.8) | 51.2 | (3.9) | 15.2 | (3.2) | 5.6 | (2.0) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 8.2 | (1.9) | 13.3 | (1.7) | 44.7 | (2.4) | 33.8 | (2.6) | 5.6 | (1.0) | 23.7 | (2.3) | 56.6 | (2.2) | 14.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 12.6 | (2.6) | 18.6 | (2.9) | 43.8 | (3.4) | 25.0 | (3.3) | 2.8 | (1.2) | 9.2 | (2.1) | 69.2 | (3.6) | 18.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Viet Nam | 8.8 | (2.2) | 12.0 | (2.6) | 56.7 | (4.0) | 22.4 | (3.3) | 7.6 | (2.3) | 13.1 | (2.4) | 77.0 | (3.3) | 2.2 | (1.2) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Promote teaching practices based on recent educational research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Praise teachers whose students are actively participating in learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 8.6 | (1.2) | 18.2 | (1.5) | 46.6 | (1.7) | 26.6 | (1.6) | 4.0 | (0.8) | 7.3 | (1.1) | 53.4 | (2.0) | 35.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Austria | 21.3 | (3.3) | 31.0 | (4.4) | 34.7 | (4.2) | 12.9 | (2.9) | 7.5 | (2.2) | 20.1 | (3.4) | 44.6 | (3.6) | 27.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Belgium | 48.5 | (3.4) | 27.0 | (3.0) | 18.1 | (2.3) | 6.4 | (1.8) | 21.8 | (2.4) | 25.3 | (2.7) | 38.1 | (3.0) | 14.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Canada | 16.3 | (1.8) | 21.5 | (2.1) | 39.0 | (2.4) | 23.2 | (2.2) | 4.0 | (0.8) | 7.8 | (1.3) | 48.2 | (2.6) | 40.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Chile | 38.1 | (3.3) | 24.8 | (3.3) | 30.2 | (3.3) | 6.9 | (2.0) | 9.9 | (2.2) | 16.6 | (3.1) | 52.3 | (3.8) | 21.2 | (3.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 18.7 | (3.1) | 28.5 | (3.4) | 35.4 | (3.4) | 17.4 | (3.2) | 6.8 | (2.3) | 31.6 | (3.6) | 46.0 | (3.6) | 15.6 | (2.8) |
|  | Denmark | 27.4 | (3.0) | 32.6 | (3.7) | 33.3 | (3.5) | 6.6 | (1.6) | 15.5 | (2.6) | 24.0 | (3.2) | 48.9 | (3.7) | 11.6 | (2.4) |
|  | Estonia | 48.2 | (2.9) | 27.9 | (2.5) | 14.8 | (2.3) | 9.1 | (1.8) | 10.8 | (1.5) | 15.8 | (2.2) | 60.9 | (2.6) | 12.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Finland | 46.9 | (4.1) | 28.1 | (3.3) | 23.2 | (3.2) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 22.2 | (3.1) | 26.7 | (3.4) | 39.6 | (3.6) | 11.5 | (2.3) |
|  | France | 66.0 | (3.6) | 20.9 | (2.9) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 23.0 | (2.9) | 34.2 | (3.3) | 31.9 | (3.3) | 10.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Germany | 23.2 | (3.1) | 23.6 | (3.0) | 42.1 | (3.7) | 11.0 | (2.5) | 6.5 | (1.6) | 19.0 | (2.8) | 52.3 | (3.6) | 22.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Greece | 17.1 | (3.5) | 24.1 | (3.5) | 42.5 | (4.1) | 16.3 | (2.7) | 12.3 | (2.4) | 19.6 | (3.1) | 48.1 | (3.9) | 19.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Hungary | 23.9 | (3.2) | 28.2 | (3.5) | 35.7 | (3.9) | 12.3 | (2.7) | 6.2 | (1.8) | 15.6 | (2.9) | 56.1 | (4.4) | 22.1 | (3.5) |
|  | Iceland | 50.4 | (0.2) | 33.2 | (0.2) | 14.4 | (0.2) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 4.6 | (0.1) | 13.5 | (0.2) | 62.7 | (0.2) | 19.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 21.9 | (3.4) | 34.7 | (3.6) | 28.0 | (3.4) | 15.5 | (2.7) | 11.5 | (2.8) | 17.5 | (3.3) | 39.3 | (4.1) | 31.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Israel | 51.8 | (4.0) | 24.6 | (3.5) | 20.6 | (3.0) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 10.6 | (2.3) | 22.7 | (3.2) | 44.8 | (3.9) | 21.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Italy | 29.6 | (2.1) | 31.1 | (2.2) | 24.9 | (1.9) | 14.5 | (1.5) | 13.8 | (1.5) | 21.7 | (1.7) | 34.9 | (2.0) | 29.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Japan | 54.2 | (3.3) | 33.8 | (3.5) | 10.4 | (2.1) | 1.6 | (1.0) | 56.6 | (4.0) | 35.6 | (3.7) | 5.6 | (1.4) | 2.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Korea | 30.4 | (3.7) | 36.6 | (4.2) | 27.8 | (3.7) | 5.3 | (1.9) | 16.6 | (3.3) | 28.4 | (4.1) | 47.9 | (4.3) | 7.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 54.4 | (0.1) | 21.4 | (0.1) | 11.8 | (0.1) | 12.4 | (0.1) | 10.6 | (0.1) | 36.0 | (0.1) | 39.1 | (0.1) | 14.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 38.1 | (1.9) | 26.2 | (1.7) | 27.7 | (1.8) | 7.9 | (0.9) | 31.6 | (1.9) | 29.2 | (1.6) | 29.3 | (1.8) | 9.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 48.4 | (4.6) | 23.9 | (4.1) | 24.1 | (3.7) | 3.5 | (1.5) | 22.1 | (3.4) | 30.2 | (4.7) | 40.9 | (3.9) | 6.8 | (2.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 7.3 | (1.8) | 31.6 | (4.1) | 46.5 | (4.3) | 14.5 | (2.7) | 4.4 | (1.4) | 9.6 | (2.4) | 60.4 | (3.9) | 25.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Norway | 17.2 | (2.6) | 36.5 | (3.7) | 37.1 | (3.7) | 9.2 | (2.3) | 21.0 | (2.9) | 20.0 | (3.3) | 45.1 | (4.0) | 13.9 | (3.0) |
|  | Poland | 47.9 | (3.7) | 34.2 | (3.4) | 14.9 | (3.1) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 12.6 | (2.8) | 33.0 | (4.1) | 39.0 | (4.3) | 15.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Portugal | 34.9 | (4.1) | 27.1 | (3.9) | 26.0 | (3.4) | 11.9 | (2.8) | 13.5 | (3.1) | 25.9 | (4.0) | 33.0 | (3.9) | 27.5 | (3.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 17.7 | (3.3) | 24.6 | (3.5) | 35.2 | (3.4) | 22.5 | (3.3) | 25.1 | (3.4) | 33.4 | (3.5) | 38.1 | (3.9) | 3.4 | (1.3) |
|  | Slovenia | 5.2 | (0.2) | 17.3 | (0.4) | 53.9 | (0.7) | 23.6 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.4) | 13.2 | (0.4) | 56.6 | (0.6) | 22.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Spain | 55.5 | (2.0) | 23.5 | (1.8) | 16.4 | (1.7) | 4.5 | (1.4) | 21.4 | (2.1) | 32.3 | (2.4) | 33.4 | (2.4) | 12.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Sweden | 22.0 | (2.5) | 28.0 | (3.4) | 39.5 | (4.0) | 10.5 | (2.1) | 8.4 | (1.9) | 17.1 | (2.8) | 59.0 | (3.6) | 15.4 | (2.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 60.7 | (3.3) | 28.4 | (3.3) | 8.5 | (1.8) | 2.4 | (1.1) | 26.0 | (3.2) | 23.7 | (2.8) | 39.5 | (3.4) | 10.8 | (2.4) |
|  | Turkey | 12.5 | (2.7) | 21.8 | (3.7) | 43.0 | (4.2) | 22.7 | (3.2) | 4.7 | (1.7) | 15.4 | (3.0) | 40.7 | (4.3) | 39.1 | (4.0) |
|  | United Kingdom | 11.3 | (1.4) | 24.8 | (3.4) | 42.9 | (3.3) | 21.0 | (2.8) | 1.6 | (0.6) | 8.1 | (1.6) | 44.7 | (3.7) | 45.7 | (3.5) |
|  | United States | 6.7 | (2.3) | 10.9 | (2.9) | 40.0 | (4.6) | 42.4 | (4.4) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 12.0 | (3.0) | 35.8 | (4.1) | 50.3 | (4.6) |
|  | OECD average | 31.8 | (0.5) | 26.8 | (0.5) | 29.3 | (0.5) | 12.0 | (0.4) | 14.0 | (0.4) | 21.8 | (0.5) | 43.8 | (0.6) | 20.3 | (0.5) |


| $\cdots$ Albania | 12.1 | (2.4) | 26.8 | (3.5) | 50.9 | (4.0) | 10.2 | (2.9) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 21.7 | (3.1) | 54.0 | (4.3) | 18.6 | (3.4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 33.7 | (3.8) | 26.0 | (3.6) | 23.1 | (3.6) | 17.1 | (3.4) | 17.9 | (3.1) | 25.6 | (3.3) | 36.8 | (4.2) | 19.8 | (3.5) |
| © Brazil | 19.0 | (2.0) | 17.0 | (2.0) | 39.2 | (2.5) | 24.8 | (2.2) | 5.5 | (1.0) | 10.1 | (1.5) | 34.2 | (2.9) | 50.1 | (3.0) |
| Bulgaria | 9.3 | (2.2) | 27.8 | (3.0) | 43.5 | (3.4) | 19.4 | (3.3) | 2.3 | (1.2) | 13.1 | (2.5) | 63.9 | (3.4) | 20.7 | (3.2) |
| Colombia | 36.4 | (3.9) | 28.7 | (3.7) | 26.5 | (3.5) | 8.4 | (2.5) | 23.1 | (3.3) | 35.7 | (3.7) | 24.4 | (3.4) | 16.7 | (3.4) |
| Costa Rica | 39.9 | (3.7) | 27.2 | (3.7) | 26.1 | (3.2) | 6.7 | (1.7) | 30.7 | (3.5) | 27.6 | (3.7) | 29.4 | (3.5) | 12.3 | (2.5) |
| Croatia | 24.5 | (3.5) | 29.4 | (3.8) | 36.0 | (3.9) | 10.1 | (2.3) | 11.5 | (2.7) | 34.5 | (3.8) | 35.3 | (3.6) | 18.7 | (3.0) |
| Cyprus* | 20.5 | (0.1) | 15.0 | (0.1) | 37.6 | (0.1) | 27.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 8.4 | (0.1) | 41.1 | (0.1) | 50.4 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 60.5 | (4.0) | 27.2 | (3.9) | 10.2 | (2.5) | 2.0 | (1.2) | 12.9 | (2.8) | 34.5 | (4.1) | 45.7 | (4.2) | 6.9 | (2.2) |
| Indonesia | 27.8 | (3.6) | 34.8 | (3.6) | 27.8 | (3.4) | 9.7 | (2.4) | 12.9 | (2.5) | 23.5 | (3.7) | 41.8 | (4.0) | 21.8 | (3.5) |
| Jordan | 14.5 | (2.6) | 17.7 | (2.3) | 39.7 | (3.7) | 28.1 | (3.3) | 6.3 | (2.1) | 4.6 | (1.5) | 36.5 | (3.8) | 52.5 | (3.7) |
| Kazakhstan | 13.1 | (2.5) | 10.0 | (2.3) | 39.7 | (3.4) | 37.2 | (3.3) | 35.7 | (4.1) | 32.3 | (3.8) | 23.4 | (3.7) | 8.6 | (1.7) |
| Latvia | 10.9 | (2.2) | 17.3 | (2.9) | 26.1 | (3.2) | 45.7 | (3.7) | 6.3 | (1.7) | 15.4 | (2.3) | 46.6 | (3.8) | 31.7 | (3.5) |
| Liechtenstein | 65.6 | (0.9) | 12.4 | (0.6) | 16.6 | (1.1) | 5.4 | (0.7) | 40.8 | (0.7) | 13.4 | (0.8) | 35.3 | (0.9) | 10.5 | (1.0) |
| Lithuania | 34.8 | (3.7) | 33.1 | (3.4) | 22.0 | (3.2) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 6.9 | (1.6) | 17.2 | (2.8) | 53.5 | (3.4) | 22.4 | (3.0) |
| Macao-China | 38.1 | (0.1) | 42.1 | (0.1) | 15.6 | (0.0) | 4.2 | (0.0) | 11.6 | (0.0) | 28.5 | (0.0) | 55.7 | (0.1) | 4.2 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 14.6 | (3.0) | 28.3 | (3.9) | 33.7 | (4.0) | 23.4 | (3.2) | 3.0 | (1.3) | 10.2 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (3.8) | 49.9 | (3.8) |
| Montenegro | 17.4 | (0.1) | 20.7 | (0.1) | 41.6 | (0.1) | 20.3 | (0.2) | 13.1 | (0.1) | 25.3 | (0.2) | 35.2 | (0.1) | 26.4 | (0.2) |
| Peru | 61.5 | (3.1) | 18.3 | (2.7) | 15.8 | (2.7) | 4.4 | (1.4) | 31.6 | (3.2) | 28.4 | (2.9) | 26.7 | (3.1) | 13.3 | (2.5) |
| Qatar | 14.5 | (0.1) | 16.8 | (0.1) | 34.4 | (0.1) | 34.3 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 11.1 | (0.1) | 37.2 | (0.1) | 51.3 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 43.3 | (3.0) | 13.2 | (2.5) | 20.6 | (3.0) | 22.8 | (2.9) | 43.6 | (2.9) | 7.4 | (2.1) | 26.2 | (3.3) | 22.9 | (2.9) |
| Russian Federation | 23.4 | (3.2) | 28.9 | (2.9) | 34.8 | (4.0) | 13.0 | (2.6) | 1.7 | (0.7) | 14.8 | (2.0) | 58.5 | (3.4) | 25.1 | (3.3) |
| Serbia | 31.3 | (3.9) | 28.6 | (4.1) | 29.9 | (3.7) | 10.1 | (2.8) | 6.2 | (2.1) | 29.0 | (3.2) | 38.5 | (4.4) | 26.2 | (4.2) |
| Shanghai-China | 41.4 | (4.2) | 37.0 | (3.8) | 19.7 | (3.5) | 2.0 | (1.1) | 7.4 | (2.4) | 33.3 | (3.8) | 46.8 | (4.1) | 12.5 | (2.9) |
| Singapore | 22.9 | (0.2) | 33.4 | (0.7) | 38.2 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.1) | 3.8 | (0.1) | 21.5 | (0.2) | 54.3 | (0.5) | 20.3 | (0.6) |
| Chinese Taipei | 31.2 | (4.1) | 31.0 | (4.1) | 27.7 | (3.9) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 10.4 | (2.4) | 19.3 | (3.5) | 50.7 | (4.4) | 19.5 | (3.2) |
| Thailand | 37.5 | (3.5) | 23.1 | (3.1) | 26.7 | (3.3) | 12.7 | (2.6) | 15.4 | (2.8) | 14.5 | (3.0) | 45.7 | (3.3) | 24.4 | (3.3) |
| Tunisia | 53.0 | (4.6) | 23.1 | (3.5) | 12.3 | (2.9) | 11.6 | (2.7) | 37.0 | (3.9) | 35.2 | (3.9) | 15.8 | (2.8) | 11.9 | (3.0) |
| United Arab Emirates | 18.0 | (2.1) | 23.6 | (2.3) | 39.4 | (2.4) | 19.0 | (1.9) | 4.7 | (1.4) | 12.0 | (1.5) | 36.7 | (2.1) | 46.6 | (2.5) |
| Uruguay | 32.5 | (3.3) | 20.8 | (3.1) | 35.5 | (3.5) | 11.2 | (2.1) | 14.5 | (2.7) | 19.7 | (2.7) | 41.1 | (3.7) | 24.7 | (3.3) |
| Viet Nam | 28.2 | (4.2) | 23.5 | (3.8) | 37.0 | (4.1) | 11.2 | (2.3) | 18.3 | (3.5) | 19.9 | (3.3) | 50.6 | (4.5) | 11.1 | (2.5) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals'reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Draw teachers' attention to the importance of developing students' critical and social capacities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, take the initiative to discuss matters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 7.1 | (1.0) | 17.5 | (1.5) | 55.7 | (1.7) | 19.7 | (1.6) | 8.4 | (1.1) | 14.8 | (1.4) | 54.4 | (1.8) | 22.5 | (1.7) |
|  | Austria | 21.2 | (3.2) | 28.1 | (3.6) | 37.4 | (3.6) | 13.3 | (2.7) | 12.0 | (2.7) | 26.7 | (3.9) | 44.5 | (3.8) | 16.8 | (3.2) |
|  | Belgium | 17.9 | (2.5) | 28.4 | (2.9) | 38.2 | (3.4) | 15.5 | (2.4) | 6.6 | (1.4) | 25.8 | (2.7) | 49.5 | (3.0) | 18.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Canada | 12.2 | (1.2) | 13.4 | (1.2) | 48.9 | (2.4) | 25.5 | (2.2) | 4.3 | (0.9) | 10.7 | (1.4) | 48.0 | (2.7) | 37.1 | (2.5) |
|  | Chile | 9.4 | (2.2) | 16.6 | (2.8) | 57.2 | (3.7) | 16.8 | (3.2) | 11.9 | (2.7) | 11.2 | (2.4) | 52.3 | (3.8) | 24.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 21.0 | (3.3) | 38.5 | (3.7) | 32.8 | (3.3) | 7.7 | (2.0) | 8.4 | (1.7) | 20.9 | (2.7) | 56.0 | (3.5) | 14.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Denmark | 26.1 | (3.1) | 24.7 | (3.0) | 40.5 | (3.5) | 8.7 | (1.9) | 6.7 | (1.7) | 12.5 | (2.0) | 63.8 | (3.2) | 17.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Estonia | 17.9 | (2.1) | 30.0 | (2.7) | 46.5 | (3.2) | 5.6 | (1.3) | 12.6 | (2.1) | 23.4 | (2.6) | 56.7 | (3.1) | 7.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Finland | 16.1 | (2.7) | 27.3 | (3.2) | 44.4 | (4.0) | 12.2 | (2.4) | 11.3 | (1.7) | 32.3 | (3.6) | 47.2 | (3.8) | 9.1 | (2.2) |
|  | France | 32.0 | (3.4) | 37.1 | (3.5) | 24.5 | (2.7) | 6.3 | (1.7) | 10.3 | (2.4) | 38.1 | (3.0) | 35.2 | (3.3) | 16.4 | (2.4) |
|  | Germany | 13.9 | (2.5) | 26.3 | (2.8) | 48.3 | (3.4) | 11.4 | (2.4) | 9.2 | (2.2) | 22.8 | (2.6) | 54.9 | (3.8) | 13.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Greece | 16.4 | (3.0) | 33.9 | (4.1) | 39.3 | (3.9) | 10.5 | (2.3) | 10.5 | (2.5) | 21.2 | (3.5) | 46.8 | (4.2) | 21.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Hungary | 25.3 | (3.9) | 29.5 | (3.8) | 38.4 | (3.7) | 6.9 | (1.7) | 4.2 | (1.6) | 17.5 | (3.2) | 60.1 | (3.8) | 18.2 | (3.1) |
|  | Iceland | 11.1 | (0.2) | 25.8 | (0.2) | 45.2 | (0.2) | 17.9 | (0.2) | 10.8 | (0.1) | 22.2 | (0.2) | 50.9 | (0.2) | 16.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 26.2 | (3.9) | 30.9 | (4.0) | 25.3 | (4.0) | 17.6 | (3.0) | 13.7 | (3.0) | 30.2 | (3.8) | 34.0 | (4.3) | 22.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Israel | 13.9 | (2.9) | 27.5 | (3.4) | 47.8 | (3.9) | 10.8 | (2.3) | 4.5 | (1.4) | 16.6 | (2.9) | 59.8 | (3.7) | 19.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Italy | 6.4 | (1.0) | 27.9 | (1.8) | 36.8 | (1.8) | 28.9 | (1.8) | 5.5 | (0.9) | 13.6 | (1.7) | 45.2 | (2.0) | 35.8 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | 52.1 | (3.3) | 29.2 | (3.0) | 17.7 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (0.7) | 33.9 | (3.6) | 30.7 | (3.3) | 29.5 | (3.3) | 5.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Korea | 22.6 | (3.6) | 30.1 | (4.0) | 42.2 | (4.2) | 5.1 | (1.8) | 16.1 | (3.1) | 25.4 | (3.5) | 50.5 | (4.1) | 8.0 | (2.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 10.4 | (0.1) | 62.3 | (0.1) | 17.7 | (0.0) | 9.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 3.1 | (0.0) | 68.3 | (0.1) | 28.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 22.2 | (1.6) | 29.4 | (2.0) | 36.2 | (1.8) | 12.2 | (1.4) | 17.3 | (1.5) | 23.0 | (1.6) | 39.9 | (2.1) | 19.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 31.3 | (4.1) | 27.6 | (3.6) | 36.4 | (4.1) | 4.7 | (2.1) | 21.3 | (4.1) | 30.8 | (4.2) | 41.1 | (4.7) | 6.8 | (2.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 18.2 | (2.6) | 23.7 | (3.5) | 46.3 | (4.4) | 11.9 | (2.8) | 21.8 | (3.4) | 24.5 | (3.6) | 44.0 | (4.2) | 9.7 | (3.0) |
|  | Norway | 17.7 | (3.1) | 32.9 | (3.7) | 40.2 | (3.8) | 9.2 | (2.2) | 12.4 | (2.6) | 24.7 | (3.5) | 54.8 | (4.1) | 8.2 | (2.1) |
|  | Poland | 23.3 | (3.5) | 32.1 | (3.8) | 36.8 | (3.5) | 7.8 | (2.0) | 10.4 | (2.4) | 14.7 | (3.0) | 59.0 | (4.0) | 15.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Portugal | 12.0 | (3.1) | 29.8 | (4.4) | 36.2 | (3.8) | 22.0 | (3.0) | 9.6 | (2.6) | 30.1 | (4.0) | 33.7 | (4.3) | 26.6 | (4.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 14.2 | (2.4) | 33.5 | (3.4) | 45.6 | (3.3) | 6.7 | (1.8) | 17.0 | (2.9) | 29.2 | (3.8) | 48.7 | (3.7) | 5.1 | (1.7) |
|  | Slovenia | 9.3 | (0.4) | 17.4 | (0.7) | 54.7 | (0.8) | 18.5 | (0.7) | 14.5 | (0.6) | 22.4 | (0.5) | 57.6 | (0.7) | 5.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 25.9 | (2.5) | 34.0 | (2.3) | 27.4 | (2.4) | 12.7 | (2.2) | 19.7 | (2.2) | 21.0 | (2.3) | 36.0 | (2.7) | 23.3 | (2.8) |
|  | Sweden | 19.1 | (2.6) | 24.9 | (3.5) | 43.1 | (3.8) | 12.9 | (2.3) | 7.9 | (2.1) | 24.5 | (2.8) | 56.2 | (3.4) | 11.4 | (2.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 35.6 | (3.5) | 28.5 | (2.3) | 29.4 | (3.5) | 6.6 | (2.0) | 15.7 | (2.5) | 27.4 | (3.5) | 47.2 | (3.5) | 9.7 | (2.3) |
|  | Turkey | 8.2 | (1.9) | 9.5 | (2.9) | 45.5 | (3.8) | 36.8 | (3.1) | 4.5 | (1.2) | 9.0 | (2.4) | 39.6 | (3.4) | 47.0 | (3.9) |
|  | United Kingdom | 11.6 | (2.0) | 15.7 | (2.7) | 48.5 | (3.4) | 24.2 | (3.0) | 7.8 | (1.5) | 15.9 | (2.6) | 51.9 | (3.5) | 24.4 | (3.3) |
|  | United States | 6.3 | (1.9) | 15.2 | (3.7) | 48.4 | (4.3) | 30.2 | (4.1) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 7.7 | (2.7) | 52.4 | (4.7) | 37.6 | (4.3) |
|  | OECD average | 18.7 | (0.5) | 27.6 | (0.5) | 40.0 | (0.6) | 13.7 | (0.4) | 11.3 | (0.4) | 21.3 | (0.5) | 49.1 | (0.6) | 18.3 | (0.5) |



* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | When a teacher discusses a classroom problem, solve the problem together |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 6.1 | (0.8) | 7.4 | (0.9) | 41.7 | (1.8) | 44.8 | (1.7) | 9.8 | (1.2) | 11.1 | (1.2) | 54.3 | (1.8) | 24.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Austria | 9.8 | (2.4) | 18.8 | (2.9) | 48.9 | (3.9) | 22.5 | (3.3) | 11.3 | (2.7) | 24.2 | (3.2) | 48.1 | (4.0) | 16.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Belgium | 1.6 | (0.8) | 16.9 | (2.7) | 44.5 | (3.3) | 37.0 | (3.1) | 3.8 | (1.4) | 21.4 | (2.9) | 48.3 | (3.4) | 26.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Canada | 2.9 | (0.8) | 5.6 | (1.2) | 31.2 | (2.3) | 60.3 | (2.5) | 2.3 | (0.7) | 8.2 | (1.3) | 42.9 | (2.5) | 46.6 | (2.5) |
|  | Chile | 3.8 | (1.4) | 8.6 | (2.2) | 43.3 | (3.5) | 44.4 | (3.9) | 7.0 | (2.0) | 13.0 | (2.6) | 47.6 | (3.7) | 32.4 | (3.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 13.8 | (2.0) | 25.4 | (3.2) | 48.3 | (3.6) | 12.5 | (2.4) | 6.6 | (1.7) | 17.4 | (2.3) | 61.2 | (3.4) | 14.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Denmark | 8.4 | (2.1) | 13.7 | (2.6) | 57.4 | (3.5) | 20.6 | (2.8) | 8.1 | (1.7) | 12.8 | (2.5) | 65.2 | (3.4) | 13.9 | (2.5) |
|  | Estonia | 7.4 | (1.6) | 20.8 | (2.3) | 58.4 | (3.0) | 13.4 | (2.1) | 10.3 | (2.0) | 23.0 | (2.5) | 59.8 | (3.4) | 7.0 | (2.0) |
|  | Finland | 3.7 | (0.8) | 19.8 | (2.6) | 57.9 | (3.7) | 18.6 | (2.9) | 2.2 | (0.5) | 11.3 | (2.2) | 65.2 | (3.1) | 21.3 | (3.0) |
|  | France | 1.2 | (0.7) | 13.1 | (2.3) | 54.3 | (3.6) | 31.5 | (3.5) | 6.7 | (1.9) | 19.7 | (3.0) | 54.2 | (3.5) | 19.4 | (3.1) |
|  | Germany | 4.7 | (1.7) | 11.7 | (2.3) | 63.2 | (3.4) | 20.4 | (2.8) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 18.1 | (3.1) | 61.3 | (3.7) | 17.0 | (2.9) |
|  | Greece | 6.8 | (1.8) | 14.4 | (2.6) | 52.9 | (3.6) | 25.9 | (3.2) | 11.3 | (2.5) | 25.5 | (3.6) | 40.1 | (3.9) | 23.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Hungary | 5.0 | (1.6) | 6.9 | (2.2) | 53.7 | (3.9) | 34.3 | (3.6) | 7.8 | (1.9) | 23.1 | (3.9) | 47.4 | (3.9) | 21.6 | (3.2) |
|  | Iceland | 3.2 | (0.1) | 9.0 | (0.1) | 55.0 | (0.2) | 32.8 | (0.2) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 7.4 | (0.2) | 47.2 | (0.2) | 42.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Ireland | 5.4 | (1.9) | 11.6 | (2.7) | 39.7 | (4.2) | 43.3 | (4.2) | 11.3 | (2.5) | 18.5 | (3.3) | 36.7 | (4.0) | 33.5 | (4.1) |
|  | Israel | 1.7 | (1.1) | 11.3 | (2.1) | 48.5 | (4.6) | 38.5 | (4.4) | 4.1 | (1.4) | 10.9 | (2.7) | 54.9 | (3.9) | 30.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Italy | 2.7 | (0.6) | 8.8 | (1.3) | 44.0 | (2.2) | 44.5 | (2.1) | 3.3 | (0.8) | 9.4 | (1.5) | 45.0 | (1.8) | 42.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Japan | 17.4 | (2.8) | 19.3 | (3.0) | 44.3 | (3.7) | 19.0 | (3.1) | 14.0 | (2.8) | 30.0 | (3.5) | 42.7 | (3.7) | 13.3 | (2.8) |
|  | Korea | 8.7 | (2.2) | 16.2 | (2.9) | 53.3 | (4.4) | 21.8 | (3.4) | 12.6 | (2.8) | 22.9 | (3.2) | 54.3 | (4.3) | 10.2 | (2.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (0.0) | 52.5 | (0.1) | 44.9 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 6.5 | (0.0) | 66.8 | (0.1) | 26.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 4.8 | (0.6) | 14.3 | (1.4) | 36.6 | (1.8) | 44.2 | (1.7) | 12.0 | (1.0) | 21.1 | (1.7) | 38.2 | (2.0) | 28.7 | (1.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 18.9 | (3.2) | 23.9 | (3.3) | 47.4 | (4.2) | 9.8 | (2.5) | 16.4 | (3.3) | 31.2 | (3.8) | 43.1 | (4.4) | 9.3 | (2.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 9.9 | (2.2) | 11.9 | (2.9) | 59.6 | (4.0) | 18.6 | (3.8) | 14.1 | (2.8) | 33.0 | (3.9) | 44.7 | (4.4) | 8.3 | (2.4) |
|  | Norway | 4.9 | (1.4) | 14.3 | (2.7) | 54.6 | (4.2) | 26.2 | (3.6) | 4.9 | (1.9) | 12.2 | (2.7) | 64.0 | (3.6) | 18.9 | (3.1) |
|  | Poland | 7.5 | (2.2) | 18.0 | (3.0) | 56.3 | (4.3) | 18.2 | (3.1) | 3.2 | (1.4) | 17.2 | (3.2) | 58.8 | (3.7) | 20.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Portugal | 0.9 | (0.6) | 3.4 | (1.9) | 26.2 | (3.6) | 69.4 | (3.9) | 5.9 | (1.7) | 15.0 | (3.0) | 40.9 | (4.4) | 38.2 | (4.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 3.3 | (1.2) | 22.3 | (3.1) | 59.0 | (3.4) | 15.4 | (2.5) | 0.6 | (0.4) | 12.8 | (2.5) | 64.7 | (3.2) | 21.9 | (3.1) |
|  | Slovenia | 3.3 | (0.2) | 15.2 | (0.4) | 55.8 | (0.7) | 25.6 | (0.5) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 31.0 | (0.6) | 51.4 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 2.3 | (0.7) | 9.2 | (1.6) | 31.1 | (2.6) | 57.3 | (3.0) | 5.5 | (1.1) | 21.7 | (2.3) | 39.7 | (2.2) | 33.1 | (2.8) |
|  | Sweden | 5.3 | (1.7) | 20.7 | (3.0) | 58.4 | (3.5) | 15.6 | (2.2) | 3.7 | (1.4) | 18.2 | (2.8) | 62.1 | (3.4) | 16.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 10.2 | (1.9) | 18.1 | (2.7) | 57.6 | (3.4) | 14.1 | (2.6) | 11.8 | (2.1) | 30.4 | (3.3) | 49.6 | (3.4) | 8.2 | (2.1) |
|  | Turkey | 0.7 | (0.7) | 6.0 | (2.3) | 37.1 | (4.0) | 56.2 | (4.0) | 4.1 | (1.8) | 5.3 | (2.1) | 35.1 | (4.0) | 55.5 | (4.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 5.8 | (1.3) | 5.0 | (1.4) | 34.7 | (3.9) | 54.5 | (3.5) | 8.9 | (1.9) | 10.0 | (1.6) | 54.9 | (3.5) | 26.2 | (3.3) |
|  | United States | 5.3 | (2.1) | 2.4 | (1.3) | 34.6 | (4.4) | 57.6 | (4.3) | 2.3 | (1.2) | 8.8 | (2.4) | 52.6 | (4.4) | 36.3 | (4.5) |
|  | OECD average | 5.8 | (0.3) | 13.1 | (0.4) | 48.3 | (0.6) | 32.8 | (0.5) | 7.1 | (0.3) | 17.7 | (0.5) | 51.3 | (0.6) | 23.9 | (0.5) |


| $\sim$ Albania | 5.5 | (1.6) | 3.9 | (1.5) | 28.7 | (3.8) | 61.9 | (3.9) | 7.5 | (2.6) | 7.0 | (1.6) | 34.6 | (3.3) | 51.0 | (3.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 1.3 | (0.7) | 8.9 | (2.1) | 23.1 | (3.3) | 66.6 | (3.6) | 4.0 | (1.4) | 9.0 | (2.0) | 33.6 | (4.1) | 53.4 | (4.1) |
| © Brazil | 2.0 | (0.8) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 11.7 | (1.4) | 84.1 | (1.7) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.9) | 18.1 | (1.7) | 77.7 | (2.0) |
| Bulgaria | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | C | 17.2 | (2.8) | 82.8 | (2.8) | 3.9 | (1.6) | 10.4 | (2.3) | 50.4 | (4.0) | 35.3 | (3.6) |
| Colombia | 4.5 | (1.2) | 10.1 | (2.1) | 33.8 | (3.8) | 51.6 | (3.9) | 9.5 | (2.8) | 14.2 | (2.4) | 41.3 | (4.1) | 35.0 | (3.6) |
| Costa Rica | 11.2 | (2.3) | 14.3 | (2.9) | 39.0 | (3.7) | 35.5 | (3.5) | 12.8 | (2.4) | 22.5 | (3.3) | 32.2 | (3.7) | 32.5 | (3.6) |
| Croatia | 2.6 | (1.3) | 11.7 | (2.4) | 56.2 | (3.7) | 29.6 | (3.6) | 1.4 | (0.9) | 13.4 | (3.0) | 52.2 | (4.0) | 33.0 | (4.0) |
| Cyprus* | 0.7 | (0.0) | 3.9 | (0.0) | 47.7 | (0.1) | 47.7 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.0) | 9.3 | (0.1) | 53.9 | (0.1) | 35.0 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 7.9 | (2.4) | 21.8 | (3.5) | 49.7 | (4.2) | 20.7 | (2.9) | 15.2 | (3.3) | 36.7 | (4.3) | 43.2 | (4.6) | 4.9 | (1.8) |
| Indonesia | 1.8 | (1.0) | 3.1 | (1.2) | 44.9 | (4.1) | 50.2 | (4.2) | 4.1 | (1.5) | 10.8 | (2.5) | 58.0 | (4.2) | 27.1 | (3.9) |
| Jordan | 4.6 | (1.8) | 2.6 | (1.1) | 39.5 | (3.7) | 53.3 | (4.1) | 3.2 | (1.2) | 5.3 | (1.5) | 35.5 | (3.4) | 56.0 | (3.7) |
| Kazakhstan | 8.1 | (2.3) | 6.5 | (1.9) | 33.0 | (3.0) | 52.5 | (3.6) | 8.8 | (2.1) | 9.1 | (2.1) | 43.5 | (3.9) | 38.5 | (3.3) |
| Latvia | 9.9 | (2.2) | 13.6 | (2.7) | 47.0 | (3.8) | 29.5 | (3.6) | 4.5 | (1.5) | 13.2 | (2.5) | 59.0 | (3.6) | 23.3 | (3.1) |
| Liechtenstein | 18.2 | (0.5) | 54.2 | (0.9) | 17.2 | (1.1) | 10.5 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c | 69.4 | (1.0) | 30.6 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c |
| Lithuania | 12.8 | (2.1) | 17.4 | (2.9) | 52.0 | (3.5) | 17.8 | (2.6) | 9.5 | (2.1) | 23.4 | (3.1) | 51.6 | (3.7) | 15.5 | (2.7) |
| Macao-China | 6.6 | (0.1) | 27.2 | (0.0) | 44.7 | (0.1) | 21.5 | (0.0) | 2.9 | (0.0) | 19.6 | (0.0) | 47.9 | (0.1) | 29.6 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 2.4 | (1.2) | 5.8 | (2.0) | 37.2 | (3.9) | 54.5 | (3.9) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 12.9 | (2.4) | 47.0 | (4.3) | 39.4 | (4.0) |
| Montenegro | 4.0 | (0.0) | 2.6 | (0.0) | 23.1 | (0.1) | 70.4 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.0) | 5.0 | (0.0) | 25.9 | (0.2) | 67.1 | (0.2) |
| Peru | 10.7 | (2.2) | 21.2 | (2.9) | 35.4 | (3.2) | 32.7 | (3.4) | 26.8 | (3.2) | 20.9 | (3.0) | 34.8 | (3.6) | 17.6 | (3.0) |
| Qatar | 13.5 | (0.1) | 6.8 | (0.1) | 19.6 | (0.1) | 60.0 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.0) | 7.2 | (0.1) | 39.4 | (0.1) | 49.0 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 46.2 | (3.3) | 9.8 | (2.3) | 22.3 | (3.4) | 21.7 | (3.0) | 46.1 | (3.0) | 9.4 | (2.4) | 21.3 | (2.6) | 23.2 | (2.8) |
| Russian Federation | 5.1 | (1.6) | 10.1 | (2.0) | 64.4 | (4.1) | 20.4 | (3.0) | 3.5 | (1.1) | 13.4 | (2.6) | 53.9 | (4.4) | 29.2 | (4.1) |
| Serbia | 1.6 | (1.1) | 7.9 | (2.3) | 45.5 | (4.1) | 45.0 | (4.3) | 5.2 | (1.7) | 17.7 | (3.5) | 45.3 | (4.7) | 31.8 | (4.0) |
| Shanghai-China | 17.8 | (3.0) | 14.1 | (2.8) | 47.5 | (4.0) | 20.6 | (3.5) | 6.7 | (2.1) | 30.8 | (3.8) | 49.0 | (3.8) | 13.5 | (2.8) |
| Singapore | 4.6 | (0.6) | 8.1 | (0.6) | 45.6 | (0.4) | 41.7 | (0.4) | 2.6 | (0.0) | 16.4 | (0.2) | 57.0 | (0.4) | 24.0 | (0.3) |
| Chinese Taipei | 5.5 | (1.9) | 10.4 | (2.5) | 47.0 | (4.3) | 37.2 | (3.9) | 8.9 | (2.1) | 21.8 | (3.7) | 55.7 | (4.1) | 13.6 | (2.7) |
| Thailand | 10.5 | (2.0) | 15.3 | (2.6) | 44.3 | (3.4) | 30.0 | (3.4) | 6.1 | (1.5) | 12.4 | (2.2) | 50.5 | (3.7) | 31.0 | (3.5) |
| Tunisia | 3.6 | (1.6) | 9.6 | (2.3) | 24.5 | (3.4) | 62.4 | (3.8) | 7.7 | (2.2) | 19.2 | (3.3) | 33.4 | (4.0) | 39.7 | (4.2) |
| United Arab Emirates | 5.0 | (1.3) | 8.2 | (1.5) | 35.1 | (2.1) | 51.7 | (2.7) | 4.3 | (1.0) | 8.0 | (1.7) | 40.9 | (2.4) | 46.8 | (3.0) |
| Uruguay | 1.7 | (0.7) | 5.6 | (2.0) | 40.9 | (3.9) | 51.8 | (3.9) | 5.8 | (2.0) | 11.0 | (2.3) | 42.4 | (3.7) | 40.8 | (3.5) |
| Viet Nam | 9.5 | (2.3) | 7.6 | (2.3) | 51.2 | (4.0) | 31.7 | (3.6) | 5.7 | (2.0) | 13.6 | (2.5) | 61.3 | (3.7) | 19.5 | (3.1) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals'reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Provide staff with opportunities to make decisions concerning the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Engage teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Never } \\ \text { or } 1-2 \text { times } \\ \text { during the year } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 2.1 | (0.6) | 12.0 | (1.3) | 61.6 | (1.9) | 24.3 | (1.8) | 1.7 | (0.5) | 11.0 | (1.3) | 49.2 | (2.1) | 38.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Austria | 7.8 | (2.0) | 26.6 | (3.5) | 46.3 | (4.4) | 19.4 | (3.1) | 11.2 | (2.7) | 23.8 | (3.4) | 49.7 | (4.0) | 15.2 | (2.9) |
|  | Belgium | 6.2 | (1.7) | 30.3 | (2.9) | 49.5 | (3.0) | 14.0 | (1.9) | 14.1 | (2.2) | 31.1 | (3.1) | 36.0 | (3.3) | 18.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Canada | 1.5 | (0.5) | 8.3 | (1.4) | 67.3 | (2.1) | 22.9 | (2.0) | 4.7 | (1.0) | 13.0 | (1.4) | 46.1 | (2.7) | 36.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Chile | 2.1 | (1.0) | 13.2 | (3.0) | 53.3 | (3.6) | 31.3 | (3.5) | 2.4 | (1.0) | 8.5 | (1.9) | 57.3 | (3.8) | 31.8 | (3.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 8.8 | (2.2) | 36.5 | (3.4) | 38.7 | (3.3) | 16.0 | (3.1) | 8.5 | (2.3) | 26.9 | (3.4) | 46.2 | (3.4) | 18.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Denmark | 3.2 | (1.3) | 12.3 | (2.3) | 71.6 | (3.3) | 12.8 | (2.6) | 3.9 | (1.4) | 14.7 | (2.5) | 58.1 | (3.5) | 23.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Estonia | 4.2 | (1.0) | 34.6 | (2.8) | 44.0 | (3.0) | 17.3 | (2.6) | 4.1 | (1.0) | 22.1 | (2.5) | 51.0 | (2.8) | 22.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Finland | 3.6 | (1.4) | 9.1 | (1.9) | 70.4 | (3.3) | 16.8 | (2.8) | 6.7 | (1.6) | 18.6 | (2.9) | 53.9 | (3.7) | 20.9 | (2.9) |
|  | France | 8.7 | (1.9) | 46.9 | (3.4) | 36.6 | (3.1) | 7.8 | (2.0) | 17.3 | (2.5) | 46.7 | (3.4) | 25.8 | (3.1) | 10.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Germany | 0.6 | (0.6) | 15.4 | (2.3) | 52.8 | (3.3) | 31.3 | (3.1) | 1.9 | (1.0) | 14.5 | (2.6) | 51.7 | (3.5) | 31.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Greece | 4.3 | (1.3) | 21.1 | (3.2) | 56.8 | (3.3) | 17.9 | (2.8) | 2.5 | (1.2) | 20.0 | (3.2) | 48.4 | (3.7) | 29.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Hungary | 5.1 | (1.7) | 29.7 | (3.4) | 59.9 | (3.6) | 5.3 | (1.7) | 19.6 | (3.7) | 23.5 | (3.2) | 44.4 | (3.6) | 12.4 | (2.6) |
|  | Iceland | 1.0 | (0.1) | 13.0 | (0.2) | 68.1 | (0.2) | 17.9 | (0.2) | 5.6 | (0.1) | 18.7 | (0.2) | 62.8 | (0.2) | 12.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 3.0 | (1.5) | 25.7 | (4.1) | 48.9 | (4.1) | 22.4 | (3.8) | 7.0 | (2.2) | 25.4 | (3.8) | 37.7 | (4.3) | 29.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Israel | 7.6 | (2.3) | 25.1 | (3.6) | 51.9 | (4.2) | 15.4 | (2.8) | 10.8 | (2.6) | 23.6 | (3.1) | 46.3 | (3.3) | 19.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Italy | 4.6 | (1.0) | 30.9 | (2.3) | 42.9 | (2.4) | 21.6 | (1.6) | 3.2 | (0.7) | 20.5 | (2.0) | 38.4 | (2.0) | 38.0 | (2.0) |
|  | Japan | 19.5 | (2.7) | 13.5 | (2.7) | 59.5 | (3.5) | 7.5 | (1.7) | 23.8 | (3.0) | 34.9 | (3.4) | 36.5 | (3.6) | 4.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Korea | 9.2 | (2.5) | 16.6 | (2.9) | 62.4 | (3.9) | 11.8 | (2.1) | 13.9 | (3.1) | 21.2 | (3.3) | 58.5 | (4.2) | 6.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.7 | (0.0) | 46.8 | (0.1) | 36.8 | (0.1) | 11.7 | (0.1) | 21.8 | (0.1) | 43.4 | (0.1) | 20.9 | (0.1) | 14.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 17.8 | (1.4) | 27.7 | (1.8) | 34.4 | (1.7) | 20.1 | (1.3) | 7.8 | (0.8) | 27.5 | (1.7) | 41.8 | (1.8) | 23.0 | (1.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 4.5 | (1.6) | 35.9 | (4.5) | 45.2 | (4.5) | 14.3 | (3.6) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 22.3 | (3.2) | 56.8 | (4.3) | 14.5 | (3.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 2.5 | (0.8) | 12.6 | (2.6) | 67.3 | (3.3) | 17.6 | (3.1) | 5.4 | (1.8) | 14.5 | (3.0) | 57.8 | (4.0) | 22.3 | (3.7) |
|  | Norway | 3.9 | (1.7) | 11.1 | (2.5) | 67.8 | (3.6) | 17.2 | (3.0) | 7.6 | (1.9) | 18.4 | (2.9) | 58.7 | (3.8) | 15.3 | (2.9) |
|  | Poland | 13.1 | (2.9) | 42.5 | (4.2) | 33.3 | (4.1) | 11.0 | (2.5) | 14.7 | (2.7) | 33.4 | (3.5) | 39.8 | (4.1) | 12.0 | (2.5) |
|  | Portugal | 5.8 | (2.3) | 7.0 | (2.1) | 56.9 | (4.6) | 30.3 | (4.1) | 2.5 | (1.1) | 17.3 | (3.5) | 38.9 | (4.1) | 41.3 | (4.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 8.6 | (2.5) | 27.8 | (3.7) | 55.2 | (3.6) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 3.3 | (1.2) | 25.4 | (3.6) | 54.8 | (4.2) | 16.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Slovenia | 6.6 | (0.7) | 21.8 | (0.4) | 53.4 | (0.8) | 18.2 | (0.5) | 3.7 | (0.6) | 13.3 | (0.4) | 57.3 | (0.8) | 25.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Spain | 4.2 | (1.1) | 22.4 | (2.3) | 54.7 | (2.6) | 18.7 | (2.0) | 4.4 | (1.1) | 31.0 | (2.1) | 43.3 | (2.4) | 21.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Sweden | 1.8 | (1.0) | 10.2 | (2.5) | 70.7 | (3.3) | 17.3 | (2.6) | 3.0 | (1.2) | 15.9 | (2.6) | 55.5 | (3.9) | 25.6 | (3.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 10.7 | (2.1) | 34.7 | (3.2) | 48.8 | (3.4) | 5.8 | (1.9) | 13.3 | (2.0) | 34.1 | (3.0) | 41.0 | (3.5) | 11.6 | (2.4) |
|  | Turkey | 2.1 | (1.0) | 13.6 | (2.8) | 40.7 | (3.7) | 43.6 | (3.4) | 2.8 | (1.0) | 9.2 | (2.3) | 42.3 | (4.3) | 45.6 | (3.9) |
|  | United Kingdom | 3.4 | (1.4) | 22.8 | (3.0) | 53.0 | (3.9) | 20.8 | (3.3) | 1.8 | (0.8) | 13.6 | (2.7) | 41.9 | (3.2) | 42.7 | (3.5) |
|  | United States | 3.5 | (1.5) | 8.9 | (2.4) | 58.9 | (4.5) | 28.6 | (4.1) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 4.5 | (1.7) | 53.9 | (4.4) | 39.6 | (4.5) |
|  | OECD average | 5.8 | (0.3) | 22.5 | (0.5) | 53.5 | (0.6) | 18.2 | (0.5) | 7.7 | (0.3) | 21.8 | (0.5) | 47.1 | (0.6) | 23.3 | (0.5) |


| Ni | Albania | 9.3 | (1.9) | 28.6 | (3.4) | 48.2 | (3.9) | 13.8 | (3.3) | 10.7 | (2.2) | 21.1 | (3.0) | 39.7 | (4.1) | 28.5 | (3.8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 11.5 | (2.2) | 21.7 | (3.3) | 36.1 | (3.8) | 30.7 | (4.0) | 4.2 | (1.2) | 17.5 | (3.4) | 32.0 | (3.7) | 46.3 | (3.9) |
|  | Brazil | 3.0 | (0.8) | 11.6 | (1.6) | 38.0 | (2.4) | 47.4 | (2.5) | 5.6 | (0.9) | 11.8 | (1.5) | 36.8 | (2.2) | 45.8 | (2.7) |
|  | Bulgaria | 6.7 | (2.0) | 18.2 | (2.6) | 59.0 | (3.8) | 16.2 | (2.8) | 3.9 | (1.3) | 21.2 | (3.2) | 52.8 | (3.7) | 22.2 | (2.9) |
|  | Colombia | 5.6 | (1.6) | 9.6 | (1.9) | 47.3 | (3.7) | 37.5 | (3.5) | 6.9 | (1.9) | 14.4 | (2.6) | 37.6 | (3.7) | 41.0 | (3.6) |
|  | Costa Rica | 14.1 | (2.3) | 19.8 | (3.3) | 48.0 | (3.6) | 18.0 | (2.7) | 11.8 | (2.3) | 20.0 | (3.4) | 44.2 | (3.6) | 24.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Croatia | 6.4 | (2.0) | 18.7 | (2.7) | 59.4 | (3.5) | 15.5 | (2.9) | 3.6 | (1.2) | 19.4 | (2.8) | 43.1 | (3.6) | 33.9 | (3.7) |
|  | Cyprus* | 3.3 | (0.0) | 6.2 | (0.1) | 71.6 | (0.1) | 18.9 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.0) | 4.1 | (0.1) | 51.3 | (0.1) | 42.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 7.4 | (2.2) | 33.4 | (4.3) | 51.4 | (4.0) | 7.9 | (2.1) | 11.2 | (2.6) | 33.5 | (4.1) | 42.9 | (4.0) | 12.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 11.3 | (2.3) | 20.3 | (3.3) | 49.4 | (4.1) | 19.0 | (3.2) | 5.7 | (1.6) | 11.9 | (2.6) | 49.5 | (4.5) | 32.9 | (4.0) |
|  | Jordan | 6.3 | (1.8) | 8.3 | (2.2) | 48.9 | (3.7) | 36.6 | (3.7) | 8.2 | (1.6) | 11.5 | (2.1) | 41.7 | (3.7) | 38.6 | (3.8) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 5.2 | (2.0) | 23.2 | (2.8) | 50.0 | (4.4) | 21.5 | (3.5) | 5.3 | (1.7) | 15.4 | (2.9) | 48.8 | (4.3) | 30.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Latvia | 6.1 | (1.9) | 25.2 | (3.2) | 49.5 | (3.6) | 19.1 | (3.2) | 3.7 | (1.4) | 15.8 | (2.5) | 54.0 | (3.5) | 26.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 | c | 56.2 | (0.8) | 42.7 | (0.9) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 95.9 | (0.7) | 4.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Lithuania | 6.1 | (1.5) | 29.3 | (3.1) | 50.0 | (3.7) | 14.6 | (2.6) | 11.8 | (2.3) | 26.1 | (2.9) | 39.5 | (3.3) | 22.6 | (2.6) |
|  | Macao-China | 23.6 | (0.0) | 45.8 | (0.0) | 24.0 | (0.1) | 6.6 | (0.0) | 15.1 | (0.0) | 46.0 | (0.1) | 34.7 | (0.1) | 4.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 5.1 | (1.8) | 24.6 | (3.5) | 46.0 | (3.8) | 24.2 | (3.3) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 14.3 | (2.7) | 49.8 | (4.0) | 34.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Montenegro | 10.9 | (0.1) | 30.5 | (0.2) | 26.9 | (0.1) | 31.7 | (0.2) | 4.8 | (0.0) | 18.6 | (0.1) | 26.2 | (0.1) | 50.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 14.3 | (2.7) | 33.4 | (3.2) | 34.5 | (3.7) | 17.8 | (2.7) | 19.4 | (3.2) | 24.7 | (3.2) | 32.6 | (3.3) | 23.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Qatar | 14.1 | (0.1) | 17.0 | (0.1) | 44.5 | (0.1) | 24.4 | (0.1) | 5.9 | (0.0) | 18.7 | (0.1) | 42.1 | (0.1) | 33.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 40.3 | (2.7) | 13.9 | (2.3) | 28.6 | (2.9) | 17.3 | (2.4) | 43.4 | (2.7) | 9.8 | (2.4) | 20.0 | (3.2) | 26.8 | (3.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 2.7 | (1.4) | 36.1 | (3.9) | 52.6 | (3.9) | 8.6 | (2.0) | 12.7 | (2.2) | 19.6 | (2.8) | 53.0 | (3.7) | 14.8 | (2.0) |
|  | Serbia | 3.0 | (1.5) | 30.5 | (4.1) | 45.5 | (4.5) | 21.0 | (3.3) | 4.5 | (1.8) | 26.3 | (3.5) | 40.0 | (4.3) | 29.2 | (4.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 48.3 | (4.3) | 37.6 | (4.0) | 12.5 | (2.4) | 1.6 | (0.7) | 17.4 | (3.1) | 41.6 | (4.1) | 32.1 | (4.1) | 8.8 | (2.3) |
|  | Singapore | 2.9 | (0.1) | 19.1 | (0.2) | 59.6 | (0.4) | 18.4 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (0.0) | 14.1 | (0.1) | 58.4 | (0.4) | 25.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 11.3 | (2.7) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 51.2 | (4.1) | 12.3 | (2.4) | 12.6 | (2.5) | 26.5 | (3.5) | 48.3 | (4.2) | 12.6 | (2.8) |
|  | Thailand | 5.0 | (1.7) | 11.5 | (2.1) | 50.2 | (3.5) | 33.2 | (3.6) | 4.8 | (1.5) | 12.9 | (2.6) | 46.2 | (4.0) | 36.0 | (3.8) |
|  | Tunisia | 13.8 | (2.8) | 34.6 | (3.4) | 26.0 | (3.8) | 25.6 | (3.4) | 15.6 | (2.9) | 34.2 | (3.6) | 25.6 | (3.6) | 24.6 | (3.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 7.1 | (1.3) | 21.1 | (2.4) | 52.3 | (2.6) | 19.5 | (2.0) | 6.0 | (1.8) | 8.8 | (1.4) | 50.3 | (2.7) | 34.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 7.4 | (2.1) | 12.8 | (2.6) | 51.9 | (3.9) | 28.0 | (3.5) | 6.6 | (2.1) | 9.6 | (2.3) | 53.3 | (3.9) | 30.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Viet Nam | 19.2 | (3.3) | 16.0 | (3.0) | 60.2 | (3.9) | 4.6 | (1.6) | 14.2 | (2.9) | 19.9 | (3.5) | 56.3 | (4.1) | 9.7 | (2.4) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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School management and leadership
Table IV.4.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that he/she engaged in the following actions during the previous academic year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ask teachers to participate in reviewing management practices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Never or 1-2 times during the year |  | 3-4 times during the year |  | Once a month to once a week |  | More than once a week |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 22.4 | (1.8) | 26.0 | (1.6) | 41.7 | (2.0) | 9.9 | (1.3) |
| Austria | 75.4 | (3.4) | 10.7 | (2.6) | 12.6 | (2.5) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Belgium | 69.9 | (3.0) | 15.9 | (2.1) | 12.0 | (2.3) | 2.2 | (0.9) |
| Canada | 35.5 | (2.0) | 20.9 | (1.7) | 38.5 | (2.3) | 5.1 | (1.1) |
| Chile | 41.0 | (3.9) | 16.8 | (3.0) | 35.5 | (3.8) | 6.8 | (1.9) |
| Czech Republic | 52.1 | (4.3) | 27.0 | (3.2) | 17.5 | (3.1) | 3.4 | (1.5) |
| Denmark | 62.2 | (3.6) | 18.9 | (3.1) | 16.5 | (2.8) | 2.3 | (1.0) |
| Estonia | 71.1 | (2.9) | 12.0 | (2.0) | 13.2 | (1.9) | 3.6 | (1.5) |
| Finland | 62.8 | (3.6) | 17.7 | (2.5) | 15.8 | (2.5) | 3.6 | (1.6) |
| France | 74.2 | (3.4) | 19.6 | (3.0) | 3.6 | (1.1) | 2.6 | (1.3) |
| Germany | 78.9 | (3.1) | 10.0 | (2.5) | 10.2 | (2.3) | 0.9 | (0.6) |
| Greece | 51.1 | (3.9) | 19.1 | (3.1) | 23.9 | (3.4) | 5.9 | (1.6) |
| Hungary | 82.4 | (2.8) | 11.3 | (2.4) | 6.2 | (1.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
| Iceland | 68.1 | (0.2) | 16.5 | (0.2) | 14.1 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) |
| Ireland | 37.7 | (4.0) | 29.6 | (4.0) | 21.6 | (3.2) | 11.0 | (2.4) |
| Israel | 59.8 | (4.3) | 20.8 | (3.3) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 3.5 | (1.4) |
| Italy | 21.0 | (1.8) | 32.7 | (2.1) | 33.8 | (2.2) | 12.5 | (1.3) |
| Japan | 35.0 | (3.6) | 18.7 | (3.0) | 44.2 | (3.5) | 2.1 | (1.0) |
| Korea | 28.7 | (4.1) | 19.6 | (3.1) | 43.1 | (4.3) | 8.7 | (2.3) |
| Luxembourg | 64.8 | (0.1) | 29.7 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.0) | 3.2 | (0.0) |
| Mexico | 42.3 | (1.9) | 22.9 | (1.9) | 27.6 | (1.6) | 7.1 | (0.7) |
| Netherlands | 56.9 | (4.4) | 23.9 | (3.8) | 17.7 | (3.3) | 1.4 | (1.0) |
| New Zealand | 30.5 | (3.7) | 26.0 | (3.9) | 38.1 | (3.9) | 5.4 | (2.1) |
| Norway | 64.6 | (3.5) | 21.4 | (2.9) | 11.9 | (2.6) | 2.1 | (1.2) |
| Poland | 35.6 | (3.8) | 41.9 | (4.0) | 20.0 | (3.2) | 2.4 | (1.3) |
| Portugal | 26.5 | (3.5) | 27.7 | (4.1) | 33.4 | (4.0) | 12.4 | (3.0) |
| Slovak Republic | 35.1 | (3.2) | 32.7 | (3.7) | 30.2 | (3.3) | 2.0 | (1.0) |
| Slovenia | 40.1 | (0.8) | 24.6 | (0.8) | 30.2 | (0.7) | 5.1 | (0.3) |
| Spain | 38.5 | (2.6) | 36.7 | (3.1) | 19.0 | (2.0) | 5.8 | (1.5) |
| Sweden | 64.5 | (3.6) | 17.1 | (2.8) | 16.1 | (2.7) | 2.3 | (1.2) |
| Switzerland | 81.9 | (2.6) | 10.6 | (2.2) | 7.1 | (1.8) | 0.4 | (0.3) |
| Turkey | 6.5 | (2.5) | 19.1 | (3.0) | 45.4 | (4.3) | 29.1 | (3.3) |
| United Kingdom | 22.3 | (2.9) | 27.5 | (2.6) | 39.8 | (3.5) | 10.3 | (2.2) |
| United States | 26.2 | (4.0) | 18.7 | (3.9) | 43.5 | (4.9) | 11.5 | (2.8) |
| OECD average | 49.0 | (0.6) | 21.9 | (0.5) | 23.6 | (0.5) | 5.5 | (0.3) |
| in Albania | 9.5 | (2.3) | 23.8 | (3.6) | 43.4 | (4.1) | 23.3 | (4.0) |
| Argentina | 45.9 | (3.5) | 21.7 | (2.8) | 18.7 | (2.9) | 13.6 | (2.4) |
| $\sim_{0}^{*}$ Brazil | 23.4 | (2.1) | 19.0 | (1.8) | 38.7 | (2.5) | 18.9 | (2.0) |
| Bulgaria | 6.9 | (2.0) | 33.7 | (3.8) | 50.5 | (3.7) | 8.9 | (2.3) |
| Colombia | 33.8 | (3.6) | 19.8 | (3.1) | 32.8 | (3.3) | 13.6 | (2.6) |
| Costa Rica | 34.8 | (3.5) | 22.4 | (3.0) | 31.3 | (4.0) | 11.5 | (2.2) |
| Croatia | 42.5 | (3.7) | 26.3 | (3.9) | 23.8 | (3.1) | 7.3 | (2.3) |
| Cyprus* | 17.1 | (0.1) | 21.7 | (0.1) | 41.2 | (0.1) | 20.0 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 15.8 | (3.1) | 43.0 | (4.7) | 39.7 | (4.3) | 1.5 | (1.0) |
| Indonesia | 16.0 | (3.3) | 23.1 | (3.4) | 48.5 | (4.0) | 12.3 | (2.5) |
| Jordan | 22.7 | (3.0) | 8.6 | (2.2) | 42.9 | (3.9) | 25.8 | (3.4) |
| Kazakhstan | 13.0 | (2.7) | 29.7 | (3.7) | 45.2 | (4.2) | 12.0 | (2.5) |
| Latvia | 43.7 | (3.8) | 27.6 | (3.7) | 24.0 | (3.5) | 4.7 | (1.5) |
| Liechtenstein | 74.1 | (0.7) | 12.3 | (0.2) | 12.5 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (0.7) |
| Lithuania | 61.2 | (3.5) | 24.6 | (2.6) | 10.0 | (2.3) | 4.2 | (1.5) |
| Macao-China | 27.5 | (0.0) | 48.0 | (0.1) | 18.1 | (0.0) | 6.3 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 10.0 | (2.1) | 20.0 | (3.4) | 46.3 | (3.6) | 23.8 | (3.4) |
| Montenegro | 20.4 | (0.1) | 28.5 | (0.2) | 35.1 | (0.2) | 16.1 | (0.2) |
| Peru | 47.0 | (3.8) | 28.8 | (3.5) | 20.4 | (3.0) | 3.8 | (1.4) |
| Qatar | 32.1 | (0.1) | 29.6 | (0.1) | 27.5 | (0.1) | 10.9 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 46.8 | (3.5) | 18.7 | (2.5) | 22.9 | (3.0) | 11.5 | (2.1) |
| Russian Federation | 16.9 | (2.6) | 39.2 | (3.2) | 42.1 | (3.3) | 1.8 | (0.8) |
| Serbia | 53.2 | (3.9) | 24.5 | (3.7) | 17.1 | (3.5) | 5.2 | (2.0) |
| Shanghai-China | 47.5 | (4.0) | 41.8 | (4.1) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 2.9 | (1.1) |
| Singapore | 32.9 | (0.3) | 33.2 | (0.6) | 28.2 | (0.5) | 5.7 | (0.1) |
| Chinese Taipei | 25.4 | (3.5) | 29.1 | (3.6) | 39.2 | (4.2) | 6.2 | (2.0) |
| Thailand | 14.0 | (2.5) | 12.2 | (2.4) | 53.6 | (3.8) | 20.2 | (3.2) |
| Tunisia | 31.0 | (3.6) | 34.8 | (3.9) | 24.2 | (3.5) | 9.9 | (2.4) |
| United Arab Emirates | 29.1 | (2.5) | 18.0 | (2.0) | 37.1 | (2.4) | 15.8 | (2.0) |
| Uruguay | 25.8 | (3.1) | 15.5 | (2.9) | 44.9 | (3.7) | 13.8 | (2.7) |
| Viet Nam | 39.7 | (3.9) | 22.5 | (3.8) | 34.1 | (4.3) | 3.7 | (1.6) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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School competition reported by principals and parents
Table IV.4.9 Results based on school principals' and parents' reports

|  |  | Students in schools whose principal reported on the number of schools competing for students in the same area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Difference between the percentage of students whose principals and parents reported that schools compete for students, and the percentage of students whose principals reported that schools DO NOT compete for students but whose parents reported that schools DO compete for students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No other school |  |  |  | One school or more |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Among these students, percentage of students whose parents reported on the number of schools competing for students in the same area |  |  |  | Among these students, percentage of students whose parents reported on the number of schools competing for students in the same area |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | No other school |  | One school or more |  | No other school |  | One school or more |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Belgium (Flemish community) | 55.8 | (9.5) | 44.2 | (9.5) | 26.0 | (1.2) | 74.0 | (1.2) | 29.8 | (9.7) |
|  | Chile | 75.2 | (3.9) | 24.8 | (3.9) | 45.0 | (2.0) | 55.0 | (2.0) | 30.2 | (4.5) |
|  | Germany | 53.0 | (3.4) | 47.0 | (3.4) | 28.8 | (2.2) | 71.2 | (2.2) | 24.2 | (4.0) |
|  | Hungary | 53.8 | (2.8) | 46.2 | (2.8) | 33.3 | (1.4) | 66.7 | (1.4) | 20.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Italy | 60.9 | (1.2) | 39.1 | (1.2) | 41.1 | (1.1) | 58.9 | (1.1) | 19.8 | (1.7) |
|  | Korea | 42.8 | (5.9) | 57.2 | (5.9) | 20.0 | (1.4) | 80.0 | (1.4) | 22.8 | (6.2) |
|  | Mexico | 65.5 | (2.8) | 34.5 | (2.8) | 31.2 | (0.8) | 68.8 | (0.8) | 34.3 | (3.1) |
|  | Portugal | 73.9 | (3.2) | 26.1 | (3.2) | 43.3 | (2.3) | 56.7 | (2.3) | 30.6 | (4.0) |
|  | Croatia | 57.6 | (3.4) | 42.4 | (3.4) | 41.2 | (1.2) | 58.8 | (1.2) | 16.5 | (3.7) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 28.1 | (2.4) | 71.9 | (2.4) | 20.8 | (0.9) | 79.2 | (0.9) | 7.2 | (2.5) |
|  | Macao-China | 41.2 | (3.2) | 58.8 | (3.2) | 33.2 | (0.7) | 66.8 | (0.7) | 8.0 | (3.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with data from the parent questionnaire are shown
StatLink 司isम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 1/1]
Parents' reports on their criteria for choosing schools for their children
Table IV.4.10
Results based on parents' reports

|  | Percentage of parent <br> The school is at a short distance to home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has a good reputation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | cho | Ifor th | heir c | hild: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school offers particular courses or school subjects |
|  | Notimportant |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notimportant |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | Veryimportant |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Not } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Belgium (Flemish community) | 8. | 7 (0.7) | 32.7 | (1.0) | 45.7 | (1.0) | 12.9 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 51.1 | (0.9) | 43.2 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 5.9 | (0.4) | 54.9 | (1.0) | 37.9 | (1.1) |
| Chile | 25. | 0 (1.1) | 23.8 | (0.6) | 27.4 | (0.7) | 23.8 | (1.0) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 10.4 | (0.7) | 33.2 | (1.0) | 54.2 | (1.4) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 13.8 | (0.5) | 44.5 | (0.7) | 37.0 | (0.8) |
| - Germany | 13. | 1 (0.8) | 30.8 | (1.1) | 38.7 | (1.0) | 17.3 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 11.1 | (0.6) | 46.3 | (1.2) | 41.4 | (1.3) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 18.2 | (0.9) | 50.9 | (0.9) | 26.2 | (0.9) |
| Hungary | 15.7 | 7 (0.9) | 33.3 | (1.0) | 34.5 | (0.9) | 16.5 | (1.0) | 2.5 | (0.3) | 13.5 | (0.8) | 52.7 | (1.0) | 31.4 | (1.2) | 6.9 | (0.5) | 17.5 | (1.0) | 48.3 | (1.2) | 27.3 | (1.1) |
| Italy | 37. | 4 (0.7) | 31.1 | (0.4) | 22.3 | (0.5) | 9.2 | (0.3) | 3.0 | (0.1) | 18.0 | (0.4) | 44.0 | (0.4) | 35.1 | (0.4) | 9.4 | (0.3) | 23.0 | (0.4) | 48.4 | (0.4) | 19.2 | (0.4) |
| Korea | 4.5 | 5 (0.4) | 27.4 | (0.8) | 45.0 | (0.8) | 23.1 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (0.6) | 48.6 | (0.8) | 40.4 | (0.9) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 17.8 | (0.7) | 54.6 | (0.6) | 24.5 | (0.7) |
| Mexico | 16. | 1 (0.4) | 18.8 | (0.4) | 32.8 | (0.4) | 32.3 | (0.5) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (0.3) | 35.2 | (0.5) | 51.5 | (0.6) | 5.9 | (0.2) | 15.1 | (0.3) | 45.0 | (0.4) | 34.0 | (0.5) |
| Portugal | 7.5 | 5 (0.6) | 23.0 | (1.0) | 29.9 | (0.9) | 39.6 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 9.6 | (0.6) | 34.5 | (1.1) | 54.3 | (1.4) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 11.2 | (0.6) | 41.3 | (0.9) | 44.4 | (1.2) |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Croatia } \\ & \text { Hong Kong-China } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 25.2 | 2 (1.0) | 24.9 | (0.6) | 35.1 | (0.9) | 14.8 | (0.7) | 5.1 | (0.3) | 17.6 | (0.7) | 49.6 | (0.8) | 27.7 | (1.0) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 14.8 | (0.6) | 52.4 | (0.8) | 30.7 | (0.9) |
|  | 14. | 4 (0.7) | 40.0 | (0.9) | 35.8 | (0.8) | 9.8 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 6.7 | (0.4) | 41.3 | (0.8) | 51.2 | (1.0) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 24.9 | (0.6) | 50.8 | (0.7) | 16.1 | (0.8) |
|  | 21.5 | 5 (0.6) | 33.0 | (0.6) | 32.8 | (0.6) | 12.7 | (0.5) | 5.0 | (0.3) | 15.9 | (0.5) | 45.7 | (0.7) | 33.4 | (0.6) | 7.0 | (0.4) | 21.4 | (0.5) | 55.0 | (0.6) | 16.6 | (0.5) |


|  | Percentage of $p$ <br> s to a particular ilosophy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | repor | ing the | the foll | wing | g reaso | s i | hoo | ing a |  | for ther | eir | ild: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has a particular approach to pedagogy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other family members attend the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Not } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | Veryimportant |  | Notimportant |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | Not important |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Belgium (Flemish community) | 41.9 | (0.9) | 31.9 | (0.7) | 22.3 | (0.8) | 3.9 | (0.4) | 65.2 | (1.0) | 20.3 | (0.6) | 12.6 | (0.7) | 1.9 | (0.3) | 57.4 | (1.1) | 19.6 | (0.7) | 18.4 | (0.9) | 4.6 | (0.4) |
| $\checkmark$ Chile | 38.8 | (1.4) | 20.6 | (0.7) | 23.5 | (0.8) | 17.1 | (1.1) | 28.2 | (0.9) | 27.5 | (0.7) | 32.3 | (0.8) | 12.0 | (0.5) | 49.9 | (1.0) | 12.1 | (0.5) | 18.9 | (0.7) | 19.1 | (0.7) |
| - Germany | 62.8 | (1.4) | 20.2 | (0.6) | 12.9 | (0.9) | 4.0 | (0.6) | 52.5 | (1.0) | 29.1 | (0.8) | 14.3 | (0.6) | 4.1 | (0.5) | 66.0 | (1.0) | 14.7 | (0.6) | 14.8 | (0.6) | 4.5 | (0.4) |
| Hungary | 71.9 | (1.8) | 15.0 | (0.8) | 8.9 | (0.9) | 4.1 | (0.9) | 67.3 | (0.8) | 21.0 | (0.7) | 9.9 | (0.4) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 64.0 | (1.1) | 15.3 | (0.6) | 15.2 | (0.8) |  | (0.4) |
| Italy | 61.0 | (0.5) | 16.3 | (0.3) | 17.8 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.2) | 48.3 | (0.5) | 24.9 | (0.4) | 22.0 | (0.4) | 4.7 | (0.2) | 67.9 | (0.5) | 11.6 | (0.3) | 14.1 | (0.3) | 6.4 | (0.2) |
| Korea | 58.0 | (0.9) | 22.1 | (0.6) | 13.8 | (0.6) | 6.1 | (0.5) | 20.0 | (0.8) | 31.5 | (0.7) | 37.4 | (0.8) | 11.1 | (0.5) | 69.6 | (0.8) | 17.7 | (0.7) | 10.1 | (0.5) | 2.5 | (0.2) |
| Mexico | 72.6 | (0.6) | 12.6 | (0.3) | 9.7 | (0.2) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 17.2 | (0.3) | 23.6 | (0.3) | 38.2 | (0.4) | 21.0 | (0.3) | 43.2 | (0.5) | 14.5 | (0.3) | 24.2 | (0.4) | 18.1 | (0.3) |
| Portugal | 46.3 | (1.2) | 28.3 | (0.7) | 20.2 | (0.8) | 5.2 | (0.5) | 34.6 | (0.8) | 34.5 | (0.7) | 25.3 | (0.8) | 5.5 | (0.4) | 38.7 | (1.0) | 20.0 | (0.7) | 26.8 | (0.8) | 14.4 | (0.7) |
| Croatia <br> Hong Kong-China <br> Macao-China | 49.4 |  | 14.8 |  | 27.9 |  |  | (0.6) | a | a |  |  | a | a | a | a | 81.1 | (0.7) |  | (0.4) | 10.1 | (0.5) |  | (0.2) |
|  | 43.6 | (1.2) | 25.5 | (0.6) | 23.6 | (0.7) | 7.3 | (0.6) | 12.7 | (0.7) | 30.3 | (1.0) | 47.4 | (0.9) | 9.6 | (0.8) | 60.6 | (0.8) | 20.4 | (0.6) | 15.6 | (0.7) | 3.4 | (0.3) |
|  | 55.1 | (0.7) | 23.0 | (0.6) | 18.3 | (0.5) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 9.5 | (0.4) | 28.6 | (0.6) | 47.2 | (0.7) | 14.6 | (0.5) | 44.9 | (0.7) | 24.9 | (0.5) | 24.5 | (0.7) | 5.7 | (0.3) |


|  |  | Percentage of pa e.g. tuition, books, d board) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ep | ng th |  | wing | g reaso | ns in | choos | ing |  | 1 for th | heir ch | Id: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | The school has financial aid available, such as a school loan, scholarship, or grant | The school has an active and pleasant school climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { important } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | Notimportant |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Not } \\ \text { important } \end{array}$ |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { important } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| U | Belgium (Flemish community) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43.6 | (0.9) | 32.9 | (0.7) | 18.4 | (0.8) | 5.1 | (0.4) | 55.7 | (1.0) | 21.2 | (0.7) | 18.1 | (0.8) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 8.9 | (0.5) | 59.8 | (0.8) | 29.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Chile | 16.5 | (0.6) | 23.5 | (0.6) | 31.0 | (0.7) | 29.0 | (0.8) | 19.9 | (0.7) | 17.8 | (0.6) | 27.4 | (0.7) | 34.9 | (0.9) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 9.6 | (0.5) | 30.5 | (0.8) | 57.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Germany | 41.4 | (0.9) | 29.8 | (0.8) | 20.5 | (0.8) | 8.4 | (0.5) | 55.9 | (1.2) | 23.1 | (0.8) | 14.9 | (0.9) | 6.1 | (0.4) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 7.4 | (0.6) | 41.7 | (1.2) | 49.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Hungary | 25.1 | (0.7) | 34.2 | (0.8) | 28.9 | (0.8) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 45.6 | (0.9) | 25.1 | (0.7) | 21.2 | (0.6) | 8.0 | (0.6) | 7.3 | (0.6) | 21.2 | (0.8) | 53.3 | (0.8) | 18.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Italy | 39.7 | (0.6) | 27.3 | (0.4) | 22.9 | (0.4) | 10.1 | (0.3) | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | 3.2 | (0.2) | 17.7 | (0.3) | 45.7 | (0.4) | 33.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Korea | 16.3 | (0.6) | 30.4 | (0.7) | 38.6 | (0.8) | 14.6 | (0.6) | 20.1 | (0.7) | 25.3 | (0.7) | 36.0 | (0.7) | 18.6 | (0.6) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 7.1 | (0.4) | 41.1 | (0.7) | 50.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | 13.9 | (0.3) | 22.4 | (0.4) | 34.8 | (0.4) | 29.0 | (0.4) | 16.1 | (0.4) | 17.5 | (0.3) | 31.9 | (0.4) | 34.4 | (0.5) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 11.5 | (0.3) | 36.4 | (0.5) | 49.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Portugal | 14.8 | (0.9) | 24.0 | (0.7) | 34.2 | (1.1) | 27.0 | (0.9) | 26.4 | (1.1) | 21.1 | (0.6) | 28.0 | (0.8) | 24.6 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 9.9 | (0.5) | 38.9 | (0.8) | 49.7 | (0.9) |
| N <br> 咅 | Croatia | 39.7 | (0.9) | 18.7 | (0.6) | 26.8 | (0.8) | 14.8 | (0.6) | 52.9 | (0.8) | 12.6 | (0.5) | 22.3 | (0.6) | 12.2 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 16.9 | (0.6) | 46.1 | (0.8) | 33.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 34.0 | (0.8) | 34.0 | (1.1) | 23.5 | (0.8) | 8.5 | (0.5) | 39.9 | (1.2) | 27.0 | (0.7) | 23.6 | (0.8) | 9.5 | (0.6) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 12.0 | (0.6) | 46.4 | (0.8) |  | (1.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 33.1 | (0.6) | 29.2 | (0.6) | 25.5 | (0.6) | 12.2 | (0.4) | 28.5 | (0.6) | 25.0 | (0.6) | 28.2 | (0.6) | 18.3 | (0.5) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 13.6 | (0.5) | 48.4 | (0.8) | 34.9 | (0.6) |


|  |  | Percentage of parents reporting the following reasons in choosing a school for their child: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | The academic achievements of students in the school are high |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | There is a safe school environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Not important |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | Very important |  | Not important |  | Somewhat important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Belgium (Flemish community) | 5.2 | (0.4) | 19.5 | (0.7) | 60.1 | (0.7) | 15.2 | (0.7) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 8.8 | (0.5) | 53.2 | (0.9) | 36.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Chile | 3.2 | (0.4) | 13.1 | (0.6) | 36.1 | (0.9) | 47.6 | (1.2) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 7.9 | (0.5) | 24.8 | (0.7) | 65.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Germany | 4.1 | (0.4) | 16.8 | (0.8) | 51.8 | (1.1) | 27.2 | (1.0) | 1.7 | (0.3) | 6.8 | (0.5) | 37.7 | (1.0) | 53.8 | (1.2) |
|  | Hungary | 4.6 | (0.4) | 19.3 | (0.8) | 53.3 | (1.0) | 22.8 | (1.0) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 5.8 | (0.4) | 45.5 | (1.0) | 47.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Italy | 8.0 | (0.3) | 23.7 | (0.3) | 45.4 | (0.4) | 22.9 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 10.2 | (0.3) | 33.2 | (0.4) | 54.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Korea | 1.4 | (0.2) | 8.3 | (0.5) | 40.0 | (0.8) | 50.4 | (1.0) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 4.4 | (0.3) | 28.4 | (0.6) | 66.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Mexico | 3.5 | (0.2) | 13.1 | (0.3) | 38.4 | (0.4) | 45.0 | (0.5) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 9.6 | (0.3) | 30.3 | (0.4) | 57.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Portugal | 2.5 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.7) | 40.2 | (0.9) | 45.2 | (1.0) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 5.3 | (0.4) | 24.3 | (0.8) | 68.9 | (1.0) |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Croatia } \\ \text { Hong Kong-China } \\ \text { Macao-China } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 5.9 | (0.4) | 16.8 | (0.6) | 46.4 | (0.8) | 31.0 | (0.8) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 10.3 | (0.5) | 32.7 | (0.7) | 55.6 | (0.8) |
|  |  | 3.3 | (0.3) | 16.4 | (0.5) | 50.7 | (0.8) | 29.6 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 32.5 | (0.9) | 62.6 | (0.9) |
|  |  | 5.1 | (0.3) | 17.3 | (0.5) | 46.6 | (0.7) | 31.0 | (0.7) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 5.6 | (0.3) | 31.9 | (0.6) | 61.3 | (0.7) |

Note: Only countries and economies with data from the parent questionnaire are shown.
StatLink 司|Ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
［Part 1／1］
Parents＇reports on their criteria for choosing schools for their children， by socio－economic status of students

|  | Percentage of parents reporting <br> The school is at a short distance to home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | the fol | in | ng rea | easons a | are＂ve | very imp | portan | ant＂ | hoosi | ing a s | school | for the | eir ch | hild： |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has a good reputation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school offers particular courses or school subjects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  |  |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | TopESCS quarter |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | Top ESCS quarter |  |
|  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| Q Belgium（Flemish community） | 12.2 | （1．0） | 12.7 | （0．9） | 12.8 | 8 （1．3） | 14.0 | （1．5） | 37.4 | （1．8） | 41.9 | 9（1．7） | 47.4 | 4 （2．0） | 47.2 | （1．9） | 36.6 | （1．8） | 37.7 | （1．9） | 37.7 | （1．7） | 39.6 | （1．6） |
| Chile | 29.5 | （2．0） | 22.9 | （1．6） | 24.2 | 2 （1．8） | 18.2 | 2 （1．5） | 46.5 | （2．3） | 56.8 | 8 （2．2） | 60.3 | 3 （2．0） | 53.5 | 5 （1．5） | 32.9 | （1．5） | 41.0 | （1．5） | 40.9 | （1．5） | 33.2 | （1．4） |
| －Germany | 21.1 | （1．9） | 17.0 | （1．4） | 17.0 | 0 （1．5） | 14.8 | （1．5） | 43.0 | （1．9） | 43.9 | 9 （2．4） | 39.8 | （2．1） | 39.4 | 4 （2．2） | 25.0 | （1．9） | 25.8 | （1．7） | 25.6 | 6 （1．8） | 28.8 | （1．9） |
| Hungary | 21.6 | （2．0） | 16.4 | （1．7） | 15.5 | 5 （1．6） | 12.3 | 3 （1．6） | 23.5 | （1．8） | 30.4 | 4 （2．1） | 31.5 | （2．2） | 40.5 | 5 （2．0） | 17.3 | （1．4） | 26.8 | （1．9） | 31.0 | （1．9） | 34.2 | （2．1） |
| Italy | 12.3 | （0．6） | 8.9 | （0．6） | 8.5 | 5 （0．5） | 7.0 | （0．5） | 31.9 | （0．8） | 34.7 | 7 （0．9） | 36.3 | （0．9） | 37.6 | （0．9） | 18.2 | （0．6） | 19.1 | （0．6） | 20.6 | （0．7） | 18.8 |  |
| Korea | 20.3 | 3 （1．4） | 23.1 | （1．5） | 24.1 | 1 （1．4） | 24.9 | （1．6） | 30.8 | （1．4） | 36.8 | 8 （1．6） | 44.6 | （1．7） | 49.3 | 3 （1．8） | 22.1 | （1．2） | 24.6 | （1．5） | 23.5 | 5 （1．4） | 27.6 | （1．5） |
| Mexico | 35.4 | （1．0） | 36.1 | （0．8） | 33.9 | 9 （0．8） | 23.8 | 8 （1．0） | 41.4 | （1．2） | 50.5 | 5 （0．9） | 54.7 | （1．0） | 59.5 | （1．0） | 28.6 | （0．8） | 31.0 | （0．8） | 36.9 | （1．0） | 39.6 | （0．9） |
| Portugal | 40.2 | （1．9） | 42.8 | （2．2） | 43.7 | 7 （2．3） | 31.9 | （2．3） | 40.6 | （2．1） | 51.4 | 4 （2．3） | 56.0 | （2．7） | 69.7 | （2．4） | 36.5 | （1．7） | 45.0 | （1．7） | 46.8 | （1．9） | 48.8 | （2．2） |
| \％Croatia | 19.9 | 9 （1．4） | 15.3 | （1．2） | 12.9 | 9 （1．3） | 11.1 | 1 （1．1） | 24.4 | （1．4） | 26.0 | 0 （1．5） | 27.2 | （1．5） | 33.2 | 2 （1．7） | 23.5 | （1．3） | 26.9 | （1．4） | 32.9 | （1．5） | 39.7 | （1．9） |
| F Hong Kong－China | 12.5 | （1．1） | 9.5 | （1．0） |  | 9 （0．9） | 8.1 | 1 （1．0） | 40.2 | （1．7） | 47.7 | 7 （1．9） | 56.4 | 4 （1．9） | 62.1 | 1 （1．9） | 15.2 | （1．1） | 15.2 | （1．1） | 16.6 | （1．2） | 17.3 | （2．5） |
| ¿ Macao－China | 14.0 | （1．1） | 11.2 | （0．8） | 12.7 | 7 （1．0） | 12.7 | （0．9） | 26.4 | （1．3） | 31.0 | 0 （1．2） | 33.7 | 7 （1．4） | 42.5 | （1．5） | 15.3 | （1．0） | 15.2 | （0．9） | 16.4 | 4 （1．0） | 19.4 | （1．1） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of parents reporting the following reasons are＂very important＂in choosing a school for their child： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The school adheres to a particular religious philosophy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has a particular approach to pedagogy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other family members attend the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  |  |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | Top ESCS quarter |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Top } \\ \text { ESCS } \\ \text { quarter } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| Q Belgium（Flemish community） | 4.1 | （0．7） | 2.8 | （0．6） | 3.3 | 3 3 （0．7） | 5.7 | 7 （0．9） | 2.6 | （0．5） |  | ． 5 （0．5） |  | （0．6） | 1.8 | （0．5） | 4.2 | （0．7） | 3.9 | （0．7） | 4.1 | （0．7） | 6.2 | （1．0） |
| Chile | 15.4 | 4 （1．4） | 17.2 | （1．5） | 17.1 | 17.1 （1．9） | 18.7 | （1．8） | 10.2 | （1．3） | 13.3 | （1．1） | 12.6 | （1．0） | 12.3 | 3 （0．9） | 23.8 | （1．6） | 19.1 | （1．4） | 17.4 | （1．3） | 16.3 | （1．0） |
| O Germany | 5.4 | 4 （1．1） | 3.2 | （0．9） | 3.9 | 9 （0．8） | 3.8 | （1．0） | 3.2 | （0．6） |  | 4 （0．9） | 4.7 | 7 （1．0） | 4.6 | （1．2） | 4.8 | （0．8） | 5.1 | （0．8） | 4.9 | （0．9） | 3.6 | （0．9） |
| Hungary | 2.9 | （0．8） | 2.3 | （0．7） |  | 7 （1．1） | 7.6 | （2．0） | 1.8 | （0．3） |  | 4 （0．4） |  | （0．6） | 1.9 | （0．5） | 6.1 | （1．0） | 5.4 | （0．9） | 4.8 | （0．9） | 5.8 | （1．0） |
| Italy | 6.7 | （0．4） | 5.0 | （0．4） |  | 7 （0．3） | 4.5 | 5 （0．6） | 5.4 | （0．4） |  | 7 （0．4） | 4.5 | （0．4） | 4.4 | 4 （0．3） | 7.9 | （0．6） | 6.8 | （0．5） | 5.8 | （0．4） | 5.1 | （0．4） |
| Korea | 4.1 | （0．7） | 5.6 | （0．7） | 7.2 | 2 （0．9） | 7.6 | （1．1） | 9.4 | （0．9） | 9.7 | 7 （1．0） | 11.5 | 5 （1．1） | 13.7 | （1．2） | 2.5 | （0．4） | 2.9 | （0．5） | 2.8 | （0．5） | 1.9 | （0．4） |
| Mexico | 3.9 | （0．3） | 3.7 | （0．3） | 4.3 | 3 （0．4） | 8.2 | 2 （1．0） | 14.3 | （0．6） | 19.3 | 3 （0．6） | 22.8 | （0．7） | 27.6 | （0．9） | 20.4 | （0．8） | 17.9 | （0．6） | 17.8 | （0．6） | 16.4 | （0．6） |
| Portugal | 7.6 | （0．9） | 5.7 | （1．0） |  | 7 （0．9） | 3.9 | （0．9） | 5.5 | （0．8） |  | 3 （0．7） | 5.2 | （0．8） | 7.2 | （1．1） | 15.3 | （1．1） | 15.2 | （1．3） | 13.7 | （1．3） | 13.5 | （1．1） |
| \％Croatia | 8.2 | （0．9） | 9.2 | （1．1） |  | 0 （0．9） | 5.8 | （0．9） | a |  |  |  |  | a | a | a a | 2.9 | （0．5） | 2.3 | （0．5） | 2.3 | （0．4） | 3.7 | （0．5） |
| F Hong Kong－China | 6.0 | （0．6） | 5.9 | （0．9） | 6.1 | 1 （0．9） | 10.9 | （1．8） | 9.8 | （1．0） |  | 2 （1．0） | 8.6 | （1．0） | 11.9 | （2．9） | 4.5 | （0．7） | 3.3 | （0．6） | 2.7 | （0．5） | 2.8 | （0．5） |
| ๕ Macao－China | 3.5 | （0．5） | 2.9 |  | 3.2 | $2(0.5)$ | 4.6 | 6 （0．6） | 13.0 | （1．0） | 12.9 | 9 （0．9） | 14.8 | （1．2） | 17.9 | （1．2） | 5.7 | （0．7） | 4.2 | （0．6） | 6.3 | （0．7） | 6.5 | （0．6） |


|  | Percentage of parents report <br> Expenses are low（e．g．tuition，books， room and board） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | he |  | as | sons a | ver | imp | por | ＂i |  | ing a |  | for th | eir chi |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has financial aid available，such as a school loan，scholarship，or grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The school has an active and pleasant school climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Top } \\ \text { ESCS } \end{gathered}$quarter |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | TopESCS quarter |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third <br> ESCS quarter |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Top } \\ \text { ESCS } \\ \text { quarter } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| Q Belgium（Flemish community） | 11.2 | 1.2 （1．2） | 5.8 | （0．9） | 2.5 | （0．7） | 0.6 | （0．2） | 10.8 | （1．1） | 6.0 | （0．9） | 2.2 | （0．6） | 0.8 | （0．3） | 21.6 | （1．4） | 28.6 | （1．7） | 32.7 | （1．5） | 35.4 | （1．9） |
| ${ }_{\sim}^{4}$ Chile | 38.8 | （2．0） | 32.6 | （1．4） | 30.0 | （1．5） | 14.2 | （1．2） | 41.0 | （1．8） | 38.4 | （1．6） | 37.8 | （1．5） | 22.3 | （1．5） | 47.1 | （1．9） | 59.0 | （1．7） | 60.0 | （1．7） | 64.6 | （1．3） |
| O Germany | 14.3 | 3 （1．2） | 9.8 | （1．3） | 5.7 | （1．0） | 3.6 | （0．8） | 12.4 | （1．3） | 5.4 | （0．9） | 3.8 | （0．7） | 2.5 | （0．6） | 45.6 | （1．7） | 49.0 | （2．2） | 49.6 | （2．0） | 54.4 | （2．4） |
| Hungary | 21.2 | 2 （1．5） | 14.1 | （1．4） | 8.5 | （1．2） | 3.8 | （0．6） | 15.8 | （1．3） | 8.3 | （1．2） | 5.6 | （1．1） | 2.5 | （0．5） | 15.7 | （1．3） | 18.2 | （1．8） | 19.6 | （1．3） | 19.6 | （1．5） |
| Italy | 14.2 | 2 （0．6） | 11.2 | （0．6） | 9.5 | （0．5） | 5.7 | （0．4） | a | a | a | ， | a | a | a |  | 31.4 | （0．9） | 33.0 | （0．9） | 34.4 | （0．8） | 35.0 | （0．8） |
| Korea | 20.5 | 5 （1．1） | 15.8 | （1．1） | 12.7 | （0．9） | 9.2 | （1．1） | 26.9 | （1．4） | 22.3 | （1．3） | 15.4 | （1．3） | 9.7 | （0．9） | 44.2 | （1．5） | 51.3 | （1．4） | 53.3 | （1．4） | 54.7 | （1．8） |
| Mexico | 31.3 | 3 （0．9） | 31.6 | （0．9） | 29.9 | （0．8） | 23.0 | （0．8） | 34.8 | （1．0） | 37.1 | （0．8） | 36.2 | （0．8） | 29.5 | （0．9） | 41.2 | （0．9） | 47.0 | （0．9） | 51.4 | （1．1） | 57.4 | （0．8） |
| Portugal | 32.2 | 2 （1．7） | 33.3 | （1．8） | 26.2 | （2．0） | 16.1 | （1．5） | 31.1 | （1．7） | 32.6 | （1．6） | 24.7 | （1．6） | 9.9 | （1．5） | 40.6 | （2．0） | 50.1 | （1．5） | 51.8 | （2．4） | 56.5 | （2．1） |
| \％Croatia | 22.7 | ． 7 （1．3） | 15.2 | （1．1） | 14.0 | （1．1） | 7.3 | （0．8） | 18.6 | （1．1） | 12.7 | （1．1） | 12.0 | （1．4） | 5.7 | （0．7） | 31.0 | （1．2） | 31.0 | （1．3） | 31.9 | （1．6） | 39.1 | （1．6） |
| Hong Kong－China | 13.5 | （1．0） | 10.2 | （1．1） | 7.0 | （1．1） | 2.9 | （0．7） | 14.7 | （1．1） | 11.3 | （1．1） | 8.2 | （1．1） | 3.3 | （0．8） | 31.6 | （1．4） | 35.9 | （1．8） | 42.8 | （1．6） | 45.2 | （2．1） |
| こ Macao－China | 18.0 | 0 （1．1） | 12.7 | （1．0） | 11.3 | （1．0） | 6.9 | （0．7） | 25.5 | （1．3） | 20.9 | （1．2） | 15.7 | （1．0） | 10.7 | （0．8） | 30.9 | （1．2） | 31.2 | （1．3） | 36.5 | （1．5） | 41.2 |  |


|  |  | Percentage of parents reporting the following reasons are＂very important＂in choosing a school for their child： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | The academic achievements of students in the school are high |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | There is a safe school environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Second ESCS } \\ \text { quarter } \end{gathered}$ |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | Top ESCS quarter |  | Bottom ESCS quarter |  | Second ESCS quarter |  | Third ESCS quarter |  | Top ESCS quarter |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { B } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Belgium（Flemish community） | 12.2 | （1．1） | 13.2 | （1．2） | 15.1 | （1．3） | 20.9 | （1．7） | 37.7 | （2．0） | 38.3 | （2．0） | 33.6 | （1．6） | 36.1 | （1．7） |
|  | Chile | 41.2 | （2．0） | 47.7 | （2．1） | 52.3 | （2．2） | 48.8 | （1．6） | 55.9 | （1．7） | 63.8 | （1．7） | 68.1 | （1．6） | 73.2 | （1．0） |
|  | Germany | 31.4 | （1．8） | 29.4 | （2．1） | 26.8 | （2．0） | 21.3 | （1．8） | 56.5 | （1．9） | 56.4 | （1．8） | 53.0 | （2．2） | 48.6 | （2．4） |
|  | Hungary | 16.0 | （1．3） | 20.5 | （1．4） | 21.8 | （2．1） | 33.6 | （2．0） | 48.5 | （2．0） | 47.1 | （1．6） | 47.5 | （2．1） | 47.3 | （1．8） |
|  | Italy | 21.0 | （0．7） | 22.7 | （0．7） | 23.7 | （0．7） | 24.4 | （0．7） | 52.7 | （0．8） | 55.2 | （0．8） | 56.1 | （0．9） | 53.3 | （0．9） |
|  | Korea | 38.9 | （1．7） | 46.2 | （1．7） | 55.9 | （2．0） | 60.4 | （1．8） | 58.1 | （1．4） | 64.3 | （1．5） | 70.2 | （1．5） | 72.3 | （1．5） |
|  | Mexico | 35.3 | （0．7） | 42.7 | （0．8） | 47.8 | （1．1） | 54.0 | （1．0） | 48.3 | （1．0） | 55.3 | （0．9） | 60.0 | （1．0） | 66.1 | （0．9） |
|  | Portugal | 34.6 | （2．2） | 45.3 | （1．8） | 48.2 | （2．1） | 53.2 | （1．9） | 59.1 | （2．1） | 68.8 | （1．8） | 70.4 | （2．3） | 77.4 | （1．8） |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ू̌ } \\ & \text { 尔 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Croatia | 29.1 | （1．5） | 28.3 | （1．4） | 29.7 | （1．4） | 37.0 | （1．9） | 56.0 | （1．5） | 54.2 | （1．4） | 56.8 | （1．6） | 55.3 | （1．5） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 26.2 | （1．6） | 29.3 | （1．4） | 31.5 | （1．6） | 31.3 | （1．5） | 58.9 | （1．6） | 58.0 | （1．8） | 65.2 | （1．8） | 68.6 | （1．6） |
|  | Macao－China | 28.6 | （1．3） | 30.6 | （1．4） | 32.5 | （1．3） | 32.6 | （1．1） | 57.6 | （1．2） | 60.4 | （1．5） | 62.7 | （1．5） | 64.3 | （1．3） |

[^33][Part 1/2]
Index of school management: Teacher participation and mathematics performance
Table IV.4.12 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 2/2]
Index of school management: Teacher participation and mathematics performance
Table IV.4.12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explainedvariancein studentperformance$(\mathbf{r}$-squared $\times \mathbf{1 0 0})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 513 | (4.0) | 508 | (4.6) | 500 | (3.8) | 496 | (4.2) | -6.3 | (2.6) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) |
| U | Austria | 511 | (10.4) | 509 | (8.3) | 503 | (8.5) | 498 | (8.8) | -5.0 | (6.1) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Belgium | 515 | (8.3) | 508 | (7.3) | 532 | (8.9) | 507 | (7.6) | -3.2 | (4.9) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Canada | 522 | (3.6) | 517 | (3.7) | 521 | (4.7) | 513 | (3.7) | -4.7 | (2.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Chile | 415 | (6.9) | 432 | (7.9) | 416 | (7.2) | 426 | (7.0) | 1.1 | (4.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 504 | (8.9) | 490 | (8.6) | 503 | (9.6) | 496 | (9.5) | 2.0 | (5.3) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 502 | (5.3) | 500 | (4.0) | 498 | (5.6) | 497 | (6.0) | -2.7 | (3.7) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Estonia | 516 | (4.3) | 518 | (4.8) | 527 | (5.4) | 522 | (5.0) | 2.6 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Finland | 526 | (3.6) | 520 | (3.2) | 516 | (3.9) | 512 | (4.5) | -5.7 | (2.0) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.2) |
|  | France | 481 | (8.6) | 502 | (8.9) | 520 | (8.9) | 480 | (11.7) | -0.4 | (6.7) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Germany | 510 | (10.9) | 509 | (8.2) | 511 | (11.8) | 525 | (8.8) | 5.6 | (7.1) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Greece | 463 | (5.8) | 456 | (6.3) | 453 | (6.8) | 440 | (7.9) | -10.6 | (3.7) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Hungary | 488 | (9.5) | 478 | (12.8) | 492 | (11.3) | 453 | (7.2) | -17.1 | (6.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Iceland | 486 | (3.7) | 490 | (3.5) | 494 | (3.3) | 504 | (3.4) | 8.7 | (2.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 508 | (5.7) | 504 | (6.7) | 492 | (7.2) | 500 | (7.7) | -3.2 | (3.8) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Israel | 471 | (12.4) | 478 | (10.6) | 458 | (12.5) | 464 | (11.1) | -5.0 | (7.5) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Italy | 487 | (5.9) | 488 | (4.8) | 492 | (5.6) | 481 | (5.1) | -1.8 | (2.7) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Japan | 542 | (9.9) | 516 | (9.3) | 545 | (9.5) | 544 | (7.1) | 5.3 | (4.3) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Korea | 552 | (9.3) | 561 | (9.1) | 555 | (10.1) | 544 | (8.8) | -3.0 | (6.0) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 482 | (2.5) | 498 | (3.5) | 489 | (2.8) | 497 | (2.4) | 9.0 | (1.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | 428 | (3.16) | 414 | (2.96) | 407 | (3.1) | 405 | (3.1) | -7.4 | (1.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 519 | (12.3) | 514 | (9.9) | 518 | (10.6) | 534 | (15.1) | 1.5 | (8.5) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 507 | (11.3) | 502 | (7.2) | 500 | (7.1) | 497 | (7.5) | -7.7 | (6.4) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.8) |
|  | Norway | 488 | (6.8) | 494 | (5.7) | 494 | (5.9) | 486 | (4.1) | -1.9 | (3.5) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Poland | 526 | (5.7) | 511 | (6.9) | 518 | (10.5) | 517 | (7.3) | -1.3 | (3.4) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 486 | (7.6) | 479 | (8.3) | 504 | (7.3) | 476 | (10.0) | -1.7 | (5.5) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 487 | (9.6) | 481 | (8.4) | 486 | (10.9) | 472 | (10.3) | -4.8 | (8.3) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Slovenia | 515 | (3.2) | 514 | (4.0) | 504 | (3.9) | 485 | (3.0) | -13.0 | (2.1) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Spain | 490 | (3.6) | 485 | (4.0) | 490 | (4.0) | 473 | (5.3) | -6.5 | (2.4) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Sweden | 478 | (5.1) | 474 | (4.9) | 475 | (5.4) | 488 | (6.2) | 1.6 | (3.4) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 531 | (7.0) | 549 | (7.3) | 533 | (9.6) | 517 | (5.9) | -6.6 | (4.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Turkey | 439 | (9.1) | 455 | (9.8) | 462 | (12.5) | 438 | (9.1) | -0.9 | (5.3) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.4) |
|  | United Kingdom | 507 | (8.1) | 498 | (8.6) | 485 | (12.0) | 487 | (5.7) | -11.0 | (3.3) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.7) |
|  | United States | 483 | (8.4) | 475 | (8.3) | 481 | (9.6) | 492 | (7.4) | 3.7 | (4.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.3) |
|  | OECD average | 496 | (1.3) | 495 | (1.2) | 496 | (1.4) | 490 | (1.3) | -2.7 | (0.8) | 1.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.1) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 395 | (4.6) | 399 | (5.3) | 389 | (4.9) | 394 | (4.8) | 0.2 | (2.4) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { E }}{ }$ | Argentina | 394 | (7.5) | 397 | (6.4) | 388 | (8.3) | 383 | (8.0) | -2.8 | (3.5) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.5) |
| ส | Brazil | 396 | (5.1) | 386 | (4.3) | 390 | (5.1) | 394 | (5.0) | 1.0 | (2.6) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Bulgaria | 434 | (9.9) | 450 | (9.9) | 442 | (8.2) | 432 | (10.4) | -1.7 | (5.9) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Colombia | 373 | (6.8) | 381 | (8.1) | 375 | (7.4) | 377 | (6.5) | 1.3 | (3.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Costa Rica | 413 | (8.0) | 401 | (6.6) | 409 | (7.4) | 406 | (8.3) | -0.7 | (3.3) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Croatia | 474 | (7.5) | 479 | (8.2) | 470 | (12.7) | 463 | (8.5) | -5.5 | (4.9) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Cyprus* | 460 | (2.0) | 450 | (2.8) | 421 | (2.5) | 427 | (2.7) | -17.6 | (1.2) | 0.7 | (0.0) | 2.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 558 | (7.8) | 563 | (9.8) | 569 | (9.4) | 555 | (10.0) | 6.0 | (6.5) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 374 | (11.2) | 367 | (7.1) | 364 | (5.7) | 398 | (10.5) | 10.6 | (4.6) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Jordan | 398 | (6.5) | 378 | (6.3) | 386 | (10.9) | 378 | (7.6) | -4.0 | (3.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 430 | (7.0) | 425 | (6.0) | 435 | (8.6) | 438 | (6.8) | 2.2 | (4.4) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Latvia | 483 | (6.7) | 487 | (5.1) | 499 | (6.7) | 485 | (5.9) | 2.2 | (4.1) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | C | -75.0 | (8.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 22.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Lithuania | 481 | (6.0) | 485 | (6.4) | 469 | (7.2) | 481 | (6.4) | 0.3 | (3.9) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Macao-China | 541 | (2.0) | 542 | (2.3) | 563 | (2.1) | 507 | (2.0) | -7.8 | (1.3) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 436 | (7.4) | 420 | (7.6) | 412 | (5.4) | 412 | (6.9) | -8.1 | (3.6) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Montenegro | 411 | (2.4) | 419 | (2.4) | 417 | (2.2) | 391 | (2.2) | -2.6 | (1.0) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 362 | (6.4) | 366 | (6.3) | 373 | (7.9) | 371 | (9.6) | 3.3 | (3.9) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Qatar | 397 | (1.3) | 355 | (1.6) | 377 | (1.4) | 377 | (1.6) | -7.7 | (0.6) | 0.6 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 448 | (8.5) | 444 | (8.1) | 436 | (8.3) | 451 | (9.4) | 0.0 | (2.7) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 477 | (7.1) | 476 | (5.5) | 492 | (7.6) | 485 | (5.1) | 4.3 | (4.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Serbia | 455 | (9.0) | 446 | (11.0) | 453 | (8.6) | 441 | (9.5) | -4.1 | (5.6) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 598 | (9.8) | 617 | (9.0) | 611 | (10.7) | 625 | (9.2) | 8.4 | (7.0) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Singapore | 573 | (2.6) | 568 | (3.0) | 572 | (2.8) | 573 | (2.5) | 1.8 | (1.4) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 567 | (8.7) | 556 | (11.9) | 548 | (12.8) | 561 | (10.4) | -4.2 | (4.4) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Thailand | 411 | (6.8) | 424 | (7.5) | 432 | (9.0) | 440 | (7.3) | 11.0 | (3.4) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (1.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 395 | (9.8) | 395 | (10.0) | 388 | (8.4) | 370 | (6.4) | -3.8 | (3.5) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.7) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 447 | (5.9) | 446 | (6.4) | 422 | (5.6) | 422 | (4.2) | -10.4 | (2.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 437 | (9.0) | 418 | (9.3) | 391 | (7.2) | 392 | (8.6) | -17.5 | (3.7) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (2.0) |
|  | Viet Nam | 511 | (9.3) | 516 | (10.2) | 516 | (9.5) | 502 | (9.0) | -0.3 | (6.1) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.4) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/1]
Correlation between indices of school management
Table IV.4.16 Results based on school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See notes at the beginning of this Annex

［Part 1／1］
Parental involvement

|  | School principals＇report on the percentage of students＇parents who participated in the following school－related activities during the previous academic year： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { ol } & \\ \text { N } & \\ \text { N } & \text { in } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O̊ } \\ & \text { 데N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 18.8 | 29.7 （0．9） | 25.6 （1．0） | 40.7 （1．1） | 4.8 （0．4） | 6.9 | 0．4） | 1.6 （0．2） | 5.0 （0．4） | 1.9 （0．2） | 4.8 （0．4） | 13.5 （0．9） | 4.1 （0．3） |
| Austria | 17.2 （1．9） | 22.1 （1．8） | 26.4 （1．8） | 28.9 （1．8） | 1.8 （0．5） | 4.9 | （1．0） | 0.9 （0．5） | 4.2 （0．7） | 1.4 （0．2） | 6.0 （0．9） | 7.7 （1．6） | 0.7 （0．4） |
| －Belgium | 20.4 （1．4） | 28.1 （2．0） | 23.9 （1．5） | 34.9 （2．1） | 1.1 （0．4） | 2.3 | （0．6） | 0.2 （0．1） | 1.4 （0．5） | 0.6 （0．2） | 3.3 （0．4） | 1.5 （0．3） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| Canada | 24.3 （1．1） | 35.7 （1．4） | 31.6 （1．0） | 41.5 （1．3） | 3.2 （0．3） | 8.9 | （0．7） | 0.8 （0．1） | 4.0 （0．4） | 1.9 （0．2） | 5.3 （0．5） | 9.0 （0．6） | 1.2 （0．6） |
| Chile | 29.3 （2．2） | 58.0 （2．3） | 28.5 （2．3） | 58.6 （2．4） | 9.1 （1．9） | 14.1 | （1．9） | 4.9 （1．4） | 15.3 （1．8） | 6.3 （1．3） | 33.8 （2．7） | 29.5 （2．5） | 1.9 （0．8） |
| Czech Republic | 17.8 （1．7） | 30.5 （2．2） | 23.9 （1．9） | 40.2 （2．1） | 0.9 （0．3） |  | （0．2） | 0.1 （0．1） | 0.3 （0．1） | 0.4 （0．1） | 4.9 （0．8） | 4.7 （1．0） | a |
| Denmark | 17.1 （1．7） | 40.9 （2．8） | 19.8 （2．0） | 73.6 （2．7） | 5.2 （1．0） | 17.3 | （2．1） | 0.4 （0．2） | 5.7 （0．9） | 1.8 （0．4） | 7.8 （0．9） | 2.0 （0．7） | 0.5 （0．4） |
| Estonia | 17.4 （1．3） | 27.3 （1．9） | 21.9 （1．4） | 39.6 （2．1） | 5.5 （0．6） | 16.0 | （1．2） | 1.0 （0．4） | 9.6 （0．9） | 6.4 （0．8） | 9.2 （0．6） | 3.3 （0．9） | 0.3 （0．2） |
| Finland | 25.6 （2．0） | 44.9 （2．2） | 28.0 （1．8） | 54.6 （2．2） | 1.2 （0．3） | 4.3 | （0．3） | 0.0 （0．0） | 0.3 （0．1） | 1.1 （0．2） | 4.4 （0．4） | 9.8 （1．1） | 0.8 （0．2） |
| France | 25.5 （1．7） | 40.3 （2．3） | 24.6 （1．8） | 40.6 （2．4） | 0.8 （0．5） | 3.0 | （0．7） | 1.2 （0．6） | 0.7 （0．2） | 2.2 （0．8） | 8.5 （1．1） | 3.4 （0．8） | 0.1 （0．1） |
| Germany | 21.6 （1．7） | 30.1 （2．1） | 27.1 （1．6） | 34.7 （1．8） | 3.7 （0．4） | 6.7 | （0．8） | 1.4 （0．2） | 5.6 （0．7） | 1.5 （0．3） | 5.5 （0．5） | 4.0 （0．6） | 0.5 （0．1） |
| Greece | 32.7 （2．2） | 33.1 （2．1） | 51.0 （2．3） | 38.6 （2．2） | 4.8 （1．0） | 6.8 | （1．4） | 1.5 （0．4） | a a | 2.9 （0．8） | 20.4 （2．0） | 14.2 （1．9） | 0.7 （0．4） |
| Hungary | 17.0 （1．8） | 19.8 （1．5） | 22.0 （1．9） | 23.5 （1．5） | 6.6 （1．2） | 12.1 | （1．8） | 0.8 （0．2） | 9.1 （1．3） | 1.4 （0．3） | 5.4 （1．0） | 11.5 （1．6） | 0.1 （0．1） |
| Iceland | 15.9 （0．1） | 40.8 （0．2） | 18.6 （0．1） | 56.9 （0．2） | 1.7 （0．0） |  | （0．1） | 0.0 （0．0） | 2.0 （0．0） | 1.8 （0．0） | 3.6 （0．0） | 12.7 （0．1） | 3.5 （0．1） |
| Ireland | 11.4 （1．4） | 23.6 （2．1） | 15.2 （1．8） | 28.5 （2．7） | 1.5 （0．3） | 4.4 | （0．7） | 0.7 （0．2） | 2.0 （0．3） | 1.9 （0．3） | 6.4 （0．7） | 13.0 （1．6） | 0.5 （0．3） |
| Israel | 24.4 （2．0） | 40.9 （2．1） | 27.9 （1．7） | 49.2 （2．2） | 4.7 （0．8） | 7.5 | （1．4） | 1.4 （0．6） | 5.4 （1．1） | 5.8 （1．2） | 11.0 | 3.4 （0．6） | 0.2 （0．1） |
| Italy | 43.2 （1．6） | 46.1 （1．5） | 47.7 （1．2） | 46.8 （1．6） | 1.0 （0．2） | 9.0 | （0．5） | 2.2 （0．3） | a a | 2.1 （0．3） | 36.0 （1．5） | 11.2 （1．2） | a a |
| Japan | 10.1 （1．5） | 63.2 （3．1） | 10.9 （1．7） | 69.7 （3．0） | 7.2 （1．3） | 6.7 | （1．1） | 0.4 （0．2） | 1.3 （0．5） | 0.4 （0．1） | 8.7 （1．5） | 4.4 （1．0） | a |
| Korea | 25.5 （2．0） | 45.4 （2．6） | 29.7 （2．0） | 47.3 （2．7） | 1.9 （0．8） | 7.0 | （1．2） | 3.7 （0．9） | 5.6 （0．8） | 2.9 （0．9） | 13.4 （1．8） | 2.6 （0．8） | 0.2 （0．2） |
| Luxembourg | 26.3 （0．0） | 43.5 （0．1） | 32.5 （0．1） | 47.8 （0．1） | 0.5 （0．0） |  | （0．0） | 0.9 （0．0） | 0.8 （0．0） | 2.1 （0．0） | 5.5 （0．0） | 6.1 （0．0） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| Mexico | 27.9 （1．2） | 45.4 （1．1） | 29.3 （1．1） | 47.8 （1．1） | 17.9 （1．2） | 17.5 | （1．2） | 6.5 （0．7） | 12.9 （1．2） | 6.3 （0．7） | 34.0 （1．5） | 25.2 （1．5） | 5.1 （0．6） |
| Netherlands | 16.8 （1．7） | 31.0 （2．5） | 27.1 （2．4） | 42.6 （2．9） | 0.9 （0．2） | 3.5 | （0．7） | 1.7 （1．0） | 0.9 （0．2） | 1.1 （0．2） | 3.4 （0．3） | 0.3 （0．1） | 0.7 （0．6） |
| New Zealand | 17.9 （1．8） | 25.8 （2．0） | 23.2 （1．8） | 41.9 （2．2） | 3.6 （0．5） | 9.7 | （0．7） | 0.6 （0．1） | 5.3 （0．6） | 1.4 （0．2） | 2.8 （0．4） | 14.3 （1．6） | 0.5 （0．2） |
| Norway | 13.0 （1．4） | $51.7 \quad$（2．8） | 17.3 （1．5） | 86.6 （1．8） | 5.9 （1．2） | 12.1 | （1．3） | 0.0 （0．0） | 0.6 （0．1） | 0.6 （0．2） | 7.2 （0．4） | 9.9 （1．7） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| Poland | 27.7 （2．2） | 52.8 （2．5） | 31.8 （2．2） | 58.6 （2．7） | 5.3 （1．2） | 19.8 | （2．0） | 3.7 （1．1） | 11.7 （1．5） | 2.7 （0．8） | 17.5 （1．7） | 15.9 （2．0） | a |
| Portugal | 35.3 （2．4） | 46.6 （2．3） | 37.8 （2．5） | 52.9 （2．7） | 0.7 （0．2） | 3.8 | （0．6） | 0.5 （0．1） | 1.0 （0．2） | 2.3 （0．4） | 6.7 （0．9） | 4.0 （1．1） | 0.2 （0．1） |
| Slovak Republic | 25.9 （2．0） | 32.1 （1．6） | 18.7 （1．6） | 23.2 （1．6） | 3.7 （0．6） | 10.0 | （1．1） | 1.0 （0．3） | 1.4 （0．4） | 1.3 （0．3） | 17.4 （1．7） | 13.3 （1．6） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| Slovenia | 30.3 （0．3） | 35.6 （0．5） | 38.4 （0．4） | 34.3 （0．4） | 2.3 （0．2） |  | （0．2） | 2.2 （0．1） | 4.1 （0．2） | 2.5 （0．1） | 15.1 （0．3） | 26.3 （0．6） | 0.5 （0．0） |
| Spain | 34.6 （1．3） | 51.9 （1．7） | 40.5 （1．1） | 61.6 （1．4） | 1.9 （0．4） | 6.1 | （0．6） | 1.3 （0．3） | 5.0 （0．5） | 2.3 （0．3） | 14.1 （0．9） | 9.0 （1．4） | 0.2 （0．0） |
| Sweden | 15.3 （1．8） | 36.0 （2．4） | 27.2 （2．1） | 80.3 （2．4） | 3.4 （1．1） | 8.2 | （1．1） | 0.2 （0．1） | 0.6 （0．1） | 2.3 （0．7） | 6.6 （0．8） | 4.6 （1．1） | 1.5 （0．8） |
| Switzerland | 18.2 （1．5） | 41.6 （2．3） | 20.2 （1．7） | 47.1 （2．4） | 0.9 （0．2） | 4.2 | （0．5） | 0.5 （0．2） | 4.3 （0．8） | 1.1 （0．1） | 3.2 （0．5） | 1.6 （0．6） | 0.3 （0．1） |
| Turkey | 32.3 （1．8） | 41.3 （2．4） | 30.1 （1．5） | 35.8 （2．4） | 10.2 （1．5） | 12.6 | （1．6） | 8.1 （1．5） | 11.6 （1．5） | 6.6 （1．3） | 22.1 （2．1） | 11.1 （1．7） | 1.6 （0．8） |
| United Kingdom | 15.0 （1．3） | 28.9 （2．3） | 18.8 （1．3） | 52.6 （2．6） | 1.3 （0．2） |  | （0．7） | 0.5 （0．1） | 2.4 （0．4） | 1.5 （0．2） | 2.3 （0．3） | 10.3 （1．4） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| United States | 23.8 （2．1） | 33.3 （2．5） | 31.6 （1．9） | $41.0 \quad(2.5)$ | 7.5 （1．2） | 13.6 | （1．3） | 2.7 （0．6） | 5.9 （1．0） | 3.4 （0．6） | 10.6 （1．7） | 23.2 （2．6） | 0.7 （0．3） |
| OECD average | 22.8 （0．3） | 38.2 （0．4） | 27.3 （0．3） | 47.1 （0．4） | 3.9 （0．1） | 8.3 | （0．2） | 1.6 （0．1） | 4.6 （0．1） | 2.4 （0．1） | 10.8 （0．2） | 9.9 （0．2） | 0.9 （0．1） |
| $\cdots$ Albania | 42.1 （2．4） | 57.9 （2．7） | 45.2 （2．5） | 57.5 （2．6） | 10.2 （1．4） | 19.1 | （2．1） | 8.8 （1．6） | 13.6 （2．0） | 17.8 （2．2） | 48.2 （2．7） | 19.0 （2．3） | 4.6 （1．4） |
| E Argentina | 22.4 （2．2） | 42.9 （2．4） | 20.2 （1．8） | 44.2 （2．5） | 8.8 （1．6） | 11.2 | （2．0） | 6.1 （1．7） | 9.9 （2．0） | 4.7 （0．9） | 17.8 （2．0） | 17.5 （2．2） | 6.0 （1．9） |
| む Brazil | 23.9 （1．2） | 41.0 （1．5） | 24.9 （1．5） | 42.4 （1．6） | 2.5 （0．4） |  | （0．7） | 2.0 （0．5） | 2.8 （0．7） | 2.8 （0．5） | 21.4 （1．7） | 4.7 （0．9） | 1.0 （0．5） |
| －Bulgaria | 30.1 （1．6） | 47.6 （2．4） | 30.1 （1．8） | 44.3 （2．4） | 8.5 （1．1） | 9.6 | （1．2） | 1.9 （0．7） | 24.0 （1．9） | 3.1 （0．7） | 12.9 （1．6） | 9.5 （1．5） | 0.0 （0．0） |
| Colombia | 37.3 （2．6） | 59.4 （2．3） | 38.7 （2．5） | 58.3 （2．3） | 12.9 （1．6） | 15.7 | （1．9） | 9.7 （1．3） | 14.4 （1．4） | 12.3 （2．1） | 50.6 （2．6） | 28.3 （2．6） | 5.8 （1．4） |
| Costa Rica | 26.0 （1．9） | 39.5 （2．3） | 30.7 （1．9） | 40.2 （2．2） | 6.8 （1．4） | 10.1 | （1．5） | 3.3 （0．9） | 8.2 （1．4） | 5.4 （1．0） | 21.1 （2．2） | 22.5 （2．3） | 2.9 （0．8） |
| Croatia | 30.8 （2．6） | 27.2 （2．3） | 32.3 （2．6） | 26.7 （2．6） | 2.3 （0．9） |  | （1．7） | $0.7 \quad(0.2)$ | a a | 1.5 （0．6） | 18.1 （2．6） | 11.0 （2．4） | a |
| Cyprus＊ | 32.0 （0．1） | 31.9 （0．1） | 40.2 （0．1） | 36.6 （0．1） | 3.3 （0．0） |  | （0．0） | 1.5 （0．0） | 4.1 （0．0） | 2.9 （0．0） | 12.7 （0．0） | 20.5 （0．0） | a |
| Hong Kong－China | 38.2 （2．7） | 65.6 （2．9） | 39.3 （2．8） | 66.5 （3．0） | 1.8 （0．3） | 6.7 | （0．9） | 2.3 （0．6） | 2.9 （0．4） | 1.4 （0．3） | 8.9 （1．8） | 12.3 （2．1） | 0.5 （0．2） |
| Indonesia | 31.2 （2．4） | 48.6 （2．5） | 32.2 （2．2） | 43.4 （2．3） | 21.3 （2．3） | 20.6 | （2．3） | 12.1 （2．1） | 18.1 （2．3） | 10.9 （1．9） | 53.4 （3．0） | 22.9 （3．0） | 5.7 （1．8） |
| Jordan | 28.8 （1．9） | 33.1 （2．1） | 27.7 （2．0） | 30.3 （2．1） | 12.4 （1．7） | 14.2 | （1．8） | 8.0 （1．3） | 10.9 （1．6） | 12.6 （1．8） | 31.3 （2．3） | 5.2 （1．2） | 4.7 （1．2） |
| Kazakhstan | 56.8 （2．8） | 55.7 （2．5） | 61.1 （2．8） | 64.7 （2．5） | 41.3 （2．7） | 52.4 | （2．7） | 33.4 （3．0） | 45.5 （3．1） | 33.8 （2．7） | 50.6 （3．0） | 15.1 （2．4） | 10.6 （2．1） |
| Latvia | 25.6 （1．8） | 35.1 （2．3） | 32.8 （1．7） | 42.0 （1．9） | 8.8 （1．2） | 22.1 | （1．5） | 1.1 （0．2） | 1.8 （0．3） | 1.8 （0．2） | 11.4 （1．4） | 9.0 （1．3） | 1.1 （0．6） |
| Liechtenstein | 11.4 （0．3） | 42.1 （0．7） | 10.8 （0．3） | 56.8 （0．4） | 0.8 （0．2） | 1.8 | （0．2） | 0.0 | 4.5 （0．1） | 0.5 （0．0） | 3.0 （0．2） | 0.4 （0．1） | 3.2 （0．3） |
| Lithuania | 31.6 （1．6） | 37.9 （2．1） | 36.2 （1．8） | 44.2 （2．2） | 7.3 （0．9） | 13.7 | （0．9） | 1.8 （0．4） | 11.0 （1．1） | 3.9 （0．4） | 9.5 （0．8） | 16.0 （1．4） | 0.3 （0．1） |
| Macao－China | 31.4 （0．0） | 80.2 （0．0） | 34.2 （0．0） | 75.5 （0．0） | 1.2 （0．0） | 8.4 | （0．0） | 1.4 （0．0） | 4.4 （0．0） | 2.9 （0．0） | 13.2 （0．0） | 24.6 （0．0） | 0.1 （0．0） |
| Malaysia | 16.8 （1．8） | 24.5 （2．3） | 16.0 （1．7） | 30.6 （2．4） | 7.0 （1．0） | 7.1 | （1．0） | 3.3 （0．8） | 7.9 （1．0） | 3.8 （0．8） | 18.7 （2．0） | 31.9 （2．9） | 3.3 （0．9） |
| Montenegro | 49.2 （0．1） | 42.8 （0．1） | 38.8 （0．1） | 38.1 （0．1） | 2.8 （0．0） | 7.1 | （0．0） | 1.7 （0．0） | 3.4 （0．0） | 0.9 （0．0） | 22.2 （0．1） | 2.4 （0．0） | a |
| Peru | 33.4 （2．1） | 41.1 （2．3） | 33.3 （2．1） | 44.0 （2．4） | 16.2 （1．8） | 15.6 | （1．8） | 5.2 （1．2） | 18.2 （2．0） | 5.4 （1．1） | 48.1 （2．6） | 30.2 （2．7） | 2.8 （0．8） |
| Qatar | 39.8 （0．1） | 46.5 （0．1） | 42.7 （0．1） | 51.7 （0．1） | 9.9 （0．0） | 21.7 | （0．1） | 16.6 （0．0） | 17.9 （0．0） | 19.7 （0．1） | 27.8 （0．1） | 15.8 （0．0） | 4.1 （0．0） |
| Romania | 39.2 （2．3） | 46.2 （2．7） | 40.1 （2．3） | 49.2 （2．5） | 15.9 （1．6） | 22.0 | （2．0） | 13.1 （1．8） | 12.3 （2．0） | 10.7 （1．3） | 35.4 （2．9） | 31.2 （2．9） | 1.8 （0．8） |
| Russian Federation | 28.0 （1．8） | 39.3 （1．9） | 38.6 （1．9） | 48.7 （2．4） | 30.9 （2．3） | 31.8 | （1．9） | 4.7 （0．9） | 26.0 （1．7） | 18.4 （1．6） | 26.6 （1．5） | 27.2 （2．0） | 7.6 （1．4） |
| Serbia | 39.3 （2．4） | 50.3 （2．5） | 36.1 （2．4） | 44.7 （2．6） | 2.1 （0．5） | 3.9 | （1．2） | 0.2 （0．1） | 0.6 （0．2） | 1.8 （0．9） | 23.1 （3．0） | 19.9 （2．9） | 0.1 （0．1） |
| Shanghai－China | 49.1 （2．8） | 58.5 （3．0） | 45.9 （2．8） | 55.1 （3．1） | 8.2 （2．0） | 13.5 | （1．9） | 5.5 （1．4） | 12.1 （2．0） | 7.5 （1．4） | 12.1 （1．4） | 13.4 （2．3） | 2.6 （1．0） |
| Singapore | 20.0 （0．1） | 49.1 （0．4） | 23.6 （0．1） | 66.0 （0．4） | 2.0 （0．0） | 5.3 | （0．3） | 0.8 （0．0） | 2.6 （0．0） | 1.0 （0．0） | 4.5 （0．0） | 14.4 （0．1） | 0.3 （0．0） |
| Chinese Taipei | 39.1 （2．2） | 41.5 （2．5） | 33.9 （2．2） | 38.3 （2．6） | 6.2 （1．3） | 9.8 | （1．8） | 4.2 （1．2） | 4.8 （0．9） | 2.7 （0．7） | 12.9 （2．1） | 9.3 （1．7） | 1.4 （0．7） |
| Thailand | 37.7 （2．9） | 53.1 （2．9） | 40.5 （2．6） | 56.3 （2．9） | 12.5 （1．4） | 17.7 | （1．5） | 9.4 （1．3） | 9.3 （1．3） | 12.0 （1．2） | 18.3 （1．5） | 50.8 （2．9） | 7.1 （1．0） |
| Tunisia | 19.4 （2．4） | 33.1 （3．0） | 15.3 （2．1） | 17.6 （2．3） | 2.2 （0．8） | 4.3 | （1．2） | 1.1 （0．4） | 1.6 （0．8） | 1.1 （0．6） | 7.3 （1．8） | 2.9 （0．8） | 0.5 （0．3） |
| United Arab Emirates | 34.6 （1．8） | 38.0 （1．8） | 38.9 （1．5） | 41.5 （1．4） | 11.7 （1．5） | 21.4 | （1．9） | 15.1 （1．5） | 15.3 （1．6） | 14.6 （1．6） | 25.3 （1．7） | 9.0 （1．0） | 3.7 （0．8） |
| Uruguay | 10.1 （0．9） | 22.6 （1．6） | 18.1 （1．6） | 27.3 （1．7） | 2.5 （0．6） | 5.4 | （0．8） | 2.7 （0．7） | 2.9 （0．6） | 1.9 （0．5） | 9.8 （1．4） | 8.3 （1．2） | 0.3 （0．3） |
| Viet Nam | 45.0 （3．3） | 49.4 （3．1） | 49.2 （3．2） | 51.8 （2．9） | 12.9 （1．9） | 14.4 | （1．8） | $12.4 \quad$（2．2） | 40.6 （3．5） | 17.9 （2．3） | 24.2 （2．9） | 61.0 （3．5） | 1.7 （1．0） |

＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 唡列四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957498
［Part 1／1］
Parents＇expectations of high academic performance
Table IV．4．18 Results based on school principals＇reports
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Government or public schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Government-dependent private schools ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Government-independent private schools ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools (government-dependent and government-independent schools combined) |  |
|  |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% S.E. |  | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
|  | Australia | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| $\frac{1}{0}$ | Austria | 92.0 | (1.9) | 504 | (3.4) | 6.7 | (1.6) | 518 | (12.6) | 1.3 | (0.6) | c | c | -18 | (12.0) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 94.2 | (0.7) | 529 | (1.8) | 3.8 | (0.6) | 573 | (10.8) | 1.9 | (0.3) | 563 | (11.1) | -41 | (8.3) |
|  | Czech Republic | 93.3 | (1.7) | 517 | (3.8) | 5.8 | (1.6) | 505 | (13.5) | 0.9 | (0.5) | C | c | 3 | (13.5) |
|  | Denmark | 77.8 | (2.5) | 515 | (3.1) | 21.7 | (2.6) | 511 | (6.3) | 0.5 | (0.5) | C | C | 4 | (7.1) |
|  | Finland | 93.3 | (1.6) | 545 | (1.8) | 6.7 | (1.6) | 539 | (12.2) | 0.0 | c | C | C | 5 | (12.3) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | 92.2 | (1.7) | 497 | (3.7) | 7.5 | (1.8) | 566 | (12.7) | 0.4 | (0.4) | c | c | -66 | (13.7) |
|  | Greece | 97.4 | (1.9) | 442 | (3.6) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 2.6 | (1.9) | 507 | (30.1) | -65 | (30.4) |
|  | Hungary | 88.9 | (2.5) | 489 | (3.6) | 9.8 | (2.3) | 504 | (16.8) | 1.2 | (0.8) | c | c | -17 | (18.1) |
|  | Iceland | 99.5 | (0.1) | 515 | (1.6) | 0.0 | C | C | c | 0.5 | (0.1) | C | C | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 41.6 | (1.6) | 486 | (3.8) | 57.6 | (1.8) | 516 | (3.3) | 0.8 | (0.9) | c | C | -31 | (5.0) |
|  | Italy | 96.1 | (1.2) | 468 | (3.1) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 392 | (61.4) | 3.5 | (1.3) | 452 | (35.4) | 22 | (22.4) |
|  | Japan | 73.0 | (1.7) | 544 | (4.7) | 0.6 | (0.6) | C | C | 26.4 | (1.8) | 513 | (7.5) | 31 | (8.6) |
|  | Korea | 42.3 | (3.7) | 527 | (6.1) | 36.0 | (4.1) | 532 | (7.5) | 21.7 | (3.4) | 593 | (9.6) | -28 | (10.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 85.9 | (0.1) | 498 | (1.1) | 14.1 | (0.1) | 463 | (2.9) | 0.0 | c | C | C | 35 | (3.3) |
|  | Mexico | 86.7 | (1.9) | 375 | (3.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | C | c | 13.2 | (1.9) | 430 | (8.9) | -55 | (9.8) |
|  | Netherlands | 23.3 | (4.2) | 516 | (14.0) | 76.7 | (4.2) | 541 | (4.5) | 0.0 | c | C | c | -25 | (16.4) |
|  | New Zealand | 95.4 | (0.5) | 522 | (2.3) | 0.0 | c | C | c | 4.6 | (0.5) | 579 | (17.1) | -57 | (17.3) |
|  | Norway | 99.1 | (0.7) | 494 | (2.4) | 0.9 | (0.7) | C | c | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 99.2 | (0.4) | 489 | (2.5) | 0.4 | (0.4) | C | c | 0.4 | (0.3) | C | C | C | C |
|  | Portugal | 93.7 | (1.3) | 465 | (3.6) | 4.2 | (1.2) | 459 | (8.5) | 2.1 | (1.2) | C | c | -19 | (16.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 87.4 | (2.7) | 495 | (3.7) | 12.6 | (2.7) | 523 | (9.3) | 0.0 | C | C | C | -27 | (10.3) |
|  | Spain | 64.2 | (1.5) | 472 | (3.4) | 28.1 | (2.1) | 505 | (4.2) | 7.7 | (1.7) | 520 | (9.7) | -35 | (5.4) |
|  | Sweden | 95.7 | (0.5) | 509 | (2.6) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 516 | (11.0) | 0.0 | c | c | C | -8 | (11.3) |
|  | Switzerland | 95.3 | (1.0) | 528 | (3.8) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 546 | (34.2) | 3.8 | (0.7) | 497 | (23.2) | 21 | (22.3) |
|  | Turkey | 99.0 | (1.0) | 420 | (6.6) | 0.0 | C | C | c | 1.0 | (1.0) | C | C | C | C |
|  | United States | 94.3 | (1.0) | 483 | (3.6) | 0.0 | C | c | c | 5.7 | (1.0) | 507 | (9.1) | -24 | (9.9) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 82.7 | (0.3) | 494 | (0.9) | 13.6 | (0.4) | 514 | (4.5) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 516 | (5.9) | -19 | (3.0) |


| $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\stackrel{y y}{む}}$ | Brazil | 87.4 | (2.3) | 342 | (6.2) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 12.6 | (2.3) | 454 | (11.3) | -112 | (13.5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 9.5 | (0.4) | 571 | (11.4) | 90.1 | (0.5) | 548 | (4.8) | 0.4 | (0.3) | c | C | 23 | (12.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 51.4 | (2.3) | 373 | (4.9) | 4.1 | (1.5) | 326 | (19.3) | 44.5 | (2.6) | 345 | (7.0) | 29 | (8.1) |
|  | Latvia | 99.0 | (0.7) | 485 | (3.7) | 0.0 | C | c | c | 1.0 | (0.7) | c | c | C | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | 95.0 | (0.3) | 539 | (4.1) | 0.0 | C | C | c | 5.0 | (0.3) | C | C | C | C |
|  | Macao-China | 5.0 | (0.1) | c | c | 49.3 | (0.2) | 528 | (3.5) | 45.8 | (0.2) | 529 | (5.2) | c | C |
|  | Russian Federation | 99.7 | (0.2) | 468 | (4.3) | 0.0 | C | C | C | 0.3 | (0.2) | C | C | C | c |
|  | Thailand | 88.0 | (1.2) | 416 | (3.0) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 419 | (18.8) | 6.0 | (1.6) | 428 | (13.7) | -7 | (12.7) |
|  | Tunisia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Uruguay | 85.9 | (0.8) | 409 | (3.7) | 0.0 | C | C | c | 14.1 | (0.8) | 501 | (6.1) | -92 | (6.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.

[Part 2/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools after accounting for the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools (government-dependent and government-independent) |  | Difference |  | Students |  | Students and schools |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
|  | Australia | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Austria | -0.28 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.11) | -0.24 | (0.12) | -6 | (10.3) | 10 | (11.9) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 0.18 | (0.02) | 0.67 | (0.08) | -0.50 | (0.08) | -27 | (6.4) | -14 | (6.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.06 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.13) | -0.07 | (0.13) | 12 | (9.8) | 17 | (10.5) |
|  | Denmark | 0.07 | (0.04) | 0.09 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.08) | 5 | (5.2) | 5 | (4.8) |
|  | Finland | 0.04 | (0.02) | 0.34 | (0.14) | -0.30 | (0.14) | 13 | (11.0) | 14 | (11.2) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | -0.05 | (0.03) | 0.74 | (0.08) | -0.79 | (0.09) | -29 | (10.7) | 17 | (11.7) |
|  | Greece | -0.35 | (0.04) | 0.95 | (0.44) | -1.30 | (0.44) | -19 | (15.5) | 42 | (9.0) |
|  | Hungary | -0.34 | (0.03) | -0.09 | (0.11) | -0.24 | (0.13) | -4 | (13.1) | 8 | (9.8) |
|  | Iceland | 0.54 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | c |
|  | Ireland | -0.49 | (0.03) | -0.08 | (0.05) | -0.41 | (0.06) | -16 | (3.9) | -3 | (4.0) |
|  | Italy | -0.30 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.07) | -0.29 | (0.08) | 31 | (22.5) | 46 | (23.5) |
|  | Japan | -0.47 | (0.03) | -0.25 | (0.05) | -0.22 | (0.06) | 41 | (6.8) | 62 | (5.6) |
|  | Korea | -0.59 | (0.05) | -0.21 | (0.05) | -0.39 | (0.08) | -14 | (8.2) | 10 | (7.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.06 | (0.02) | -0.30 | (0.04) | 0.25 | (0.04) | 27 | (3.5) | 13 | (3.4) |
|  | Mexico | -1.52 | (0.04) | -0.37 | (0.13) | -1.15 | (0.14) | -25 | (8.0) | 19 | (8.1) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.18 | (0.08) | -0.09 | (0.04) | -0.10 | (0.10) | -10 | (10.7) | -2 | (8.6) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.16 | (0.02) | 0.60 | (0.11) | -0.76 | (0.11) | -23 | (12.8) | 12 | (9.7) |
|  | Norway | 0.18 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | C |
|  | Poland | -0.42 | (0.02) | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c |
|  | Portugal | -0.93 | (0.04) | -0.62 | (0.36) | -0.31 | (0.36) | -11 | (9.9) | -2 | (10.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.27 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.08) | -0.25 | (0.09) | -15 | (7.8) | -2 | (7.3) |
|  | Spain | -0.76 | (0.06) | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.63 | (0.09) | -20 | (4.4) | -6 | (4.3) |
|  | Sweden | 0.07 | (0.03) | 0.44 | (0.11) | -0.38 | (0.11) | 6 | (8.2) | 17 | (7.0) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.26 | (0.03) | 0.17 | (0.12) | -0.43 | (0.12) | 40 | (20.1) | 62 | (19.6) |
|  | Turkey | -1.20 | (0.06) | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c |
|  | United States | 0.05 | (0.03) | 0.48 | (0.11) | -0.43 | (0.12) | -6 | (8.3) | 11 | (9.7) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.29 | (0.01) | 0.10 | (0.03) | -0.40 | (0.03) | -4 | (2.2) | 14 | (2.1) |
| む | Brazil | -1.77 | (0.05) | -0.10 | (0.09) | -1.68 | (0.11) | -73 | (14.0) | 12 | (20.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -1.25 | (0.11) | -1.27 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.12) | 22 | (10.0) | 20 | (8.9) |
|  | Indonesia | -1.82 | (0.05) | -1.92 | (0.06) | 0.10 | (0.08) | 27 | (7.2) | 23 | (6.1) |
|  | Latvia | -0.35 | (0.03) | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.31 | (0.04) | c | C | c | C | c | C | C | c |
|  | Macao-China | c | C | -1.58 | (0.03) | C | C | C | C | C | C |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.62 | (0.03) | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | c |
|  | Thailand | -1.92 | (0.04) | -1.45 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.10) | 3 | (11.9) | 13 | (11.5) |
|  | Tunisia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Uruguay | -0.95 | (0.04) | 0.39 | (0.07) | -1.34 | (0.08) | -55 | (6.7) | 16 | (11.4) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies


Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Government or public schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Government-dependent private schools ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Government-independent private schools ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools (government-dependent and government-independent schools combined) |  |
|  |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 61.0 | (0.7) | 489 | (2.3) | 26.5 | (1.0) | 510 | (2.9) | 12.5 | (0.9) | 559 | (3.6) | -37 | (3.4) |
| 0 | Austria | 91.4 | (2.3) | 502 | (3.2) | 7.5 | (2.1) | 546 | (15.9) | 1.1 | (0.9) | 559 | (14.5) | -45 | (14.9) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 92.2 | (0.8) | 514 | (2.0) | 4.3 | (0.6) | 570 | (8.1) | 3.5 | (0.8) | 566 | (10.1) | -54 | (6.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 91.8 | (1.9) | 498 | (3.8) | 6.9 | (1.6) | 493 | (17.3) | 1.3 | (0.9) | c | c | -6 | (17.3) |
|  | Denmark | 77.0 | (1.8) | 494 | (2.5) | 18.9 | (2.0) | 517 | (6.2) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 527 | (13.0) | -25 | (6.4) |
|  | Finland | 97.0 | (0.7) | 518 | (2.0) | 3.0 | (0.7) | 542 | (7.2) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -24 | (7.7) |
|  | France | 82.8 | (1.4) | 490 | (3.2) | 17.2 | (1.4) | 521 | (6.6) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -31 | (7.4) |
|  | Germany | 94.5 | (1.6) | 511 | (3.5) | 5.0 | (1.6) | 549 | (19.4) | 0.5 | (0.4) | c | c | -44 | (19.7) |
|  | Greece | 97.7 | (0.7) | 450 | (2.7) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 2.3 | (0.7) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Hungary | 84.0 | (2.9) | 475 | (3.4) | 16.0 | (2.9) | 489 | (14.1) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -15 | (15.1) |
|  | Iceland | 99.5 | (0.1) | 493 | (1.7) | 0.5 | (0.1) |  | c | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 43.8 | (0.9) | 492 | (3.9) | 54.0 | (1.1) | 502 | (3.0) | 2.2 | (1.1) | c | c | -12 | (5.0) |
|  | Italy | 95.3 | (0.7) | 487 | (2.3) | 1.8 | (0.4) | 437 | (7.1) | 2.9 | (0.5) | 515 | (8.9) | 3 | (7.7) |
|  | Japan | 70.1 | (1.2) | 535 | (3.3) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 29.9 | (1.2) | 540 | (9.6) | -5 | (10.3) |
|  | Korea | 52.7 | (4.1) | 546 | (7.1) | 31.4 | (3.8) | 539 | (7.2) | 15.9 | (3.1) | 609 | (10.5) | -17 | (10.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 84.9 | (0.1) | 492 | (1.3) | 13.4 | (0.0) | 464 | (2.4) | 1.8 | (0.0) | c | c | 13 | (2.7) |
|  | Mexico | 90.7 | (0.9) | 408 | (1.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | c | c | 9.2 | (0.8) | 452 | (6.0) | -43 | (6.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 33.6 | (4.4) | 516 | (10.0) | 66.4 | (4.4) | 523 | (5.6) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -7 | (12.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 94.7 | (1.4) | 496 | (2.5) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 5.3 | (1.4) | 583 | (6.8) | -87 | (6.9) |
|  | Norway | 98.3 | (1.0) | 489 | (2.8) | 1.7 | (1.0) | c | c | 0.0 | c | , | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 97.1 | (0.4) | 516 | (3.6) | 1.9 | (0.4) | 566 | (22.1) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 581 | (14.9) | -56 | (12.9) |
|  | Portugal | 89.9 | (2.0) | 481 | (3.8) | 5.8 | (1.9) | 516 | (7.3) | 4.2 | (1.4) | 581 | (5.2) | -62 | (9.4) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 91.0 | (2.4) | 478 | (4.1) | 8.6 | (2.5) | 520 | (20.2) | 0.5 | (0.3) | c | c | -42 | (20.4) |
|  | Spain | 68.2 | (0.8) | 471 | (2.5) | 24.4 | (1.1) | 506 | (3.6) | 7.4 | (1.0) | 523 | (4.8) | -39 | (3.3) |
|  | Sweden | 86.0 | (0.7) | 476 | (2.4) | 14.0 | (0.7) | 491 | (7.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -15 | (8.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 93.7 | (1.3) | 532 | (3.3) | 1.5 | (0.8) | 567 | (18.4) | 4.8 | (1.0) | 505 | (13.0) | 12 | (14.8) |
|  | Turkey | 100.0 | c | 447 | (4.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | United States | 94.9 | (0.9) | 482 | (4.0) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 5.1 | (0.9) | 496 | (10.0) | -14 | (11.4) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 83.1 | (0.4) | 492 | (0.7) | 13.0 | (0.4) | 519 | (2.8) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 541 | (2.9) | -28 | (2.4) |


| 慦 | Brazil | 86.5 | (1.3) | 376 | (2.0) | 0.6 | (0.4) | c | c | 12.8 | (1.3) | 461 | (6.9) | -83 | (6.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 7.0 | (0.2) | 597 | (9.5) | 91.9 | (0.8) | 560 | (3.5) | 1.2 | (0.7) | c | c | 37 | (10.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 58.9 | (2.6) | 377 | (5.0) | 17.5 | (2.3) | 342 | (5.6) | 23.7 | (2.7) | 395 | (10.7) | 5 | (8.9) |
|  | Latvia | 97.7 | (1.5) | 490 | (2.9) | 0.4 | (0.4) | c | c | 1.9 | (1.3) | c | C | C | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | 93.6 | (0.4) | 541 | (3.9) | 0.0 | C | C | c | 6.4 | (0.4) | C | C | C | C |
|  | Macao-China | 4.2 | (0.0) | c | c | 81.3 | (0.0) | 537 | (1.1) | 14.5 | (0.0) | 559 | (2.9) | c | C |
|  | Russian Federation | 99.4 | (0.6) | 482 | (3.0) | 0.0 | C | c | C | 0.6 | (0.6) | C | C | C | C |
|  | Thailand | 83.5 | (0.6) | 433 | (3.8) | 11.6 | (1.5) | 396 | (5.1) | 4.9 | (1.3) | 398 | (23.2) | 36 | (8.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 99.4 | (0.4) | 389 | (3.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 0.6 | (0.4) | c | C | c | c |
|  | Uruguay | 83.3 | (1.2) | 393 | (2.6) | 0.0 | C | C | C | 16.7 | (1.2) | 492 | (6.6) | -100 | (7.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.

[Part 4/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools after accounting for the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools (government-dependent and government-independent) |  | Difference |  | Students |  | Students and schools |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 0.06 | (0.01) | 0.52 | (0.02) | -0.46 | (0.02) | -17 | (3.4) | 8 | (4.3) |
|  | Austria | 0.02 | (0.02) | 0.64 | (0.13) | -0.62 | (0.14) | -18 | (13.3) | 21 | (15.7) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 0.37 | (0.02) | 0.85 | (0.07) | -0.48 | (0.07) | -38 | (6.5) | -25 | (6.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.08 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.10) | -0.15 | (0.11) | 3 | (14.0) | 16 | (12.5) |
|  | Denmark | 0.35 | (0.03) | 0.69 | (0.05) | -0.34 | (0.05) | -11 | (5.0) | 0 | (4.6) |
|  | Finland | 0.35 | (0.02) | 0.69 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.08) | -13 | (6.9) | -5 | (6.7) |
|  | France | -0.11 | (0.02) | 0.28 | (0.04) | -0.38 | (0.05) | -8 | (6.6) | 26 | (7.9) |
|  | Germany | 0.15 | (0.03) | 0.65 | (0.16) | -0.51 | (0.17) | -17 | (16.0) | 23 | (15.7) |
|  | Greece | -0.12 | (0.03) | c | c | c | c | c | C | c | C |
|  | Hungary | -0.27 | (0.03) | -0.12 | (0.11) | -0.15 | (0.12) | -8 | (10.8) | 1 | (8.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.79 | (0.01) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 0.03 | (0.03) | 0.13 | (0.03) | -0.10 | (0.04) | -8 | (4.1) | -4 | (3.7) |
|  | Italy | -0.07 | (0.02) | 0.23 | (0.10) | -0.30 | (0.11) | 12 | (6.1) | 31 | (7.8) |
|  | Japan | -0.15 | (0.02) | 0.12 | (0.04) | -0.28 | (0.04) | 6 | (8.7) | 43 | (6.7) |
|  | Korea | 0.00 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.06) | -15 | (8.4) | -12 | (6.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.06 | (0.02) | 0.12 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.03) | 15 | (3.0) | 18 | (2.8) |
|  | Mexico | -1.30 | (0.02) | 0.29 | (0.08) | -1.59 | (0.08) | -16 | (5.4) | 18 | (4.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.22 | (0.06) | 0.21 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.07) | -8 | (10.6) | -9 | (7.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.84 | (0.07) | -0.84 | (0.07) | -43 | (7.2) | 0 | (9.4) |
|  | Norway | 0.47 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | C | C | c | C |
|  | Poland | -0.24 | (0.03) | 0.77 | (0.09) | -1.01 | (0.09) | -15 | (11.3) | 15 | (12.9) |
|  | Portugal | -0.58 | (0.05) | 0.37 | (0.21) | -0.95 | (0.22) | -29 | (4.8) | -7 | (7.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.23 | (0.03) | 0.25 | (0.14) | -0.47 | (0.16) | -17 | (14.8) | 7 | (11.9) |
|  | Spain | -0.39 | (0.03) | 0.20 | (0.05) | -0.59 | (0.06) | -21 | (3.3) | -10 | (4.1) |
|  | Sweden | 0.24 | (0.02) | 0.48 | (0.08) | -0.24 | (0.08) | -7 | (6.4) | 2 | (5.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.13 | (0.02) | 0.71 | (0.06) | -0.57 | (0.06) | 34 | (14.3) | 71 | (15.5) |
|  | Turkey | -1.48 | (0.03) | c | c | c | C | c | C | C | c |
|  | United States | 0.15 | (0.04) | 0.73 | (0.11) | -0.58 | (0.12) | 7 | (8.1) | 27 | (6.4) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.06 | (0.01) | 0.40 | (0.02) | -0.45 | (0.02) | -11 | (1.9) | 8 | (1.9) |
| ※ | Brazil | -1.42 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.09) | -1.39 | (0.09) | -60 | (6.0) | -19 | (7.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.77 | (0.12) | -0.79 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.13) | 34 | (10.0) | 33 | (12.0) |
|  | Indonesia | -1.78 | (0.06) | -1.81 | (0.09) | 0.03 | (0.11) | 4 | (7.6) | 4 | (6.8) |
|  | Latvia | -0.27 | (0.03) | c | c | C | C | C | C | C | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.27 | (0.05) | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | c |
|  | Macao-China | c | c | -0.87 | (0.01) | c | C | c | C | c | C |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.11 | (0.02) | c | c | c | C | C | C | c | C |
|  | Thailand | -1.37 | (0.04) | -1.23 | (0.15) | -0.14 | (0.15) | 39 | (6.4) | 42 | (5.2) |
|  | Tunisia | -1.20 | (0.05) | c | c | c | c | c | C | C | C |
|  | Uruguay | -1.15 | (0.03) | 0.46 | (0.07) | -1.61 | (0.07) | -55 | (5.9) | 28 | (8.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies


Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Government or public schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Government-dependent private schools ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Government-independent private schools ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools (government-dependent and government-independent schools combined) |  |
|  |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Percentage of students |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
|  | Australia | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| - | Austria | -0.6 | (3.0) | -2 | (5.0) | 0.8 | (2.7) | 27 | (20.3) | -0.2 | (1.1) | c | c | -27 | (19.4) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | -2.1 | (1.0) | -16 | (3.3) | 0.5 | (0.9) | -4 | (13.7) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 3 | (15.2) | -14 | (11.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | -1.6 | (2.6) | -19 | (5.7) | 1.2 | (2.3) | -12 | (22.0) | 0.4 | (1.1) | c | c | -8 | (21.9) |
|  | Denmark | -0.9 | (3.1) | -22 | (4.5) | -2.8 | (3.3) | 6 | (9.1) | 3.7 | (1.6) | c | c | -29 | (10.3) |
|  | Finland | 3.6 | (1.7) | -27 | (3.3) | -3.6 | (1.7) | 2 | (14.3) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -29 | (14.7) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | 2.4 | (2.3) | 14 | (5.5) | -2.5 | (2.4) | -16 | (23.3) | 0.1 | (0.6) | c | c | 22 | (24.4) |
|  | Greece | 0.3 | (2.0) | 7 | (4.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -0.3 | (2.0) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Hungary | -4.9 | (3.8) | -14 | (5.4) | 6.2 | (3.7) | -14 | (22.1) | -1.2 | c | c | c | 2 | (23.6) |
|  | Iceland | -0.1 | (0.1) | -22 | (3.0) | 0.5 | c | c | c | -0.5 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Ireland | 2.2 | (1.8) | 6 | (5.8) | -3.6 | (2.1) | -14 | (4.9) | 1.4 | (1.4) | c | c | 18 | (7.1) |
|  | Italy | -0.8 | (1.4) | 19 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (0.5) | 45 | (61.9) | -0.7 | (1.4) | 63 | (36.5) | -20 | (24.4) |
|  | Japan | -2.9 | (2.0) | -9 | (6.1) | -0.6 | c | c | c | 3.5 | (2.1) | 27 | (12.4) | -35 | (13.7) |
|  | Korea | 10.4 | (5.5) | 19 | (9.6) | -4.6 | (5.6) | 7 | (10.6) | -5.8 | (4.6) | 16 | (14.3) | 11 | (13.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | -1.0 | (0.1) | -6 | (2.6) | -0.8 | (0.1) | 1 | (4.3) | 1.8 | c | c | c | -22 | (5.0) |
|  | Mexico | 4.0 | (2.1) | 33 | (4.3) | 0.0 | (0.2) | c | c | -4.0 | (2.1) | 22 | (10.9) | 12 | (11.8) |
|  | Netherlands | 10.3 | (6.1) | 0 | (17.3) | -10.3 | (6.1) | -18 | (7.4) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 18 | (21.0) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.8 | (1.5) | -26 | (3.9) | 0.0 | c | c | c | 0.8 | (1.5) | 4 | (18.5) | -30 | (18.7) |
|  | Norway | -0.8 | (1.2) | -5 | (4.1) | 0.8 | (1.2) | c | c | 0.0 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | -2.2 | (0.5) | 26 | (4.8) | 1.5 | (0.6) | c | c | 0.7 | (0.4) | c | c | c | c |
|  | Portugal | -3.8 | (2.3) | 16 | (5.6) | 1.6 | (2.2) | 57 | (11.4) | 2.2 | (1.9) | c | c | -43 | (19.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 3.5 | (3.6) | -18 | (5.9) | -4.0 | (3.7) | -2 | (22.3) | 0.5 | c | c | c | -15 | (24.5) |
|  | Spain | 4.0 | (1.7) | -1 | (4.7) | -3.7 | (2.4) | 2 | (5.9) | -0.3 | (2.0) | 3 | (11.0) | -3 | (6.5) |
|  | Sweden | -9.7 | (0.9) | -33 | (4.1) | 9.7 | (0.9) | -25 | (13.7) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -7 | (14.7) |
|  | Switzerland | -1.6 | (1.7) | 4 | (5.4) | 0.6 | (1.1) | 21 | (38.9) | 1.0 | (1.3) | 7 | (26.7) | -9 | (26.0) |
|  | Turkey | 1.0 | c | 28 | (8.4) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -1.0 | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | United States | 0.6 | (1.3) | -1 | (5.7) | 0.0 | c | c | c | -0.6 | (1.3) | -11 | (13.6) | 9 | (14.7) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.5 | (0.5) | -2 | (1.2) | -0.6 | (0.6) | 3 | (5.2) | 0.1 | (0.4) | 15 | (6.5) | -9 | (3.7) |


| $\stackrel{\text { N }}{巳}$ | Brazil | -0.9 | (2.7) | 35 | (6.8) | 0.6 | c | c | c | 0.3 | (2.7) | 6 | (13.4) | 29 | (14.6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -2.5 | (0.4) | 26 | (15.0) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 12 | (6.3) | 0.8 | (0.8) | C | c | 14 | (15.5) |
|  | Indonesia | 7.5 | (3.5) | 5 | (7.2) | 13.4 | (2.8) | 16 | (20.2) | -20.8 | (3.8) | 49 | (12.9) | -24 | (12.2) |
|  | Latvia | -1.3 | (1.7) | 5 | (5.1) | 0.4 | C | c | C | 0.9 | (1.5) | C | c | C | c |
|  | Liechtenstein | -1.3 | (0.5) | 2 | (6.0) | 0.0 | C | C | C | 1.3 | (0.5) | C | C | C | C |
|  | Macao-China | -0.8 | (0.1) | C | c | 32.0 | (0.2) | 9 | (4.1) | -31.3 | (0.2) | 29 | (6.3) | C | c |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.4 | (0.7) | 14 | (5.6) | 0.0 | C | c | C | 0.4 | (0.7) | C | C | C | c |
|  | Thailand | -4.6 | (1.3) | 17 | (5.2) | 5.7 | (1.9) | -23 | (19.6) | -1.1 | (2.0) | -30 | (27.0) | 43 | (15.2) |
|  | Tunisia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Uruguay | -2.6 | (1.5) | -17 | (4.9) | 0.0 | c | C | c | 2.6 | (1.5) | -9 | (9.2) | -8 | (10.2) |

[^34][Part 6/6]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in school type and performance in mathematics
Table IV.4.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools after accounting for the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of: |  |  |  |
|  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools (government-dependent and government-independent) |  | Difference |  | Students |  | Students and schools |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
|  | Australia | w | w | w | w | W | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Austria | 0.30 | (0.04) | 0.68 | (0.17) | -0.38 | (0.18) | -12 | (16.8) | 13 | (19.5) |
|  | Belgium | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Canada | 0.20 | (0.02) | 0.18 | (0.10) | 0.02 | (0.10) | -12 | (9.5) | -12 | (9.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.05 | (0.17) | -0.07 | (0.17) | -11 | (17.2) | -5 | (17.1) |
|  | Denmark | 0.27 | (0.04) | 0.60 | (0.09) | -0.32 | (0.10) | -16 | (7.7) | -7 | (7.0) |
|  | Finland | 0.31 | (0.03) | 0.35 | (0.16) | -0.04 | (0.17) | -28 | (13.1) | -27 | (12.9) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | 0.20 | (0.04) | -0.09 | (0.18) | 0.29 | (0.19) | 12 | (20.4) | -6 | (20.8) |
|  | Greece | 0.23 | (0.05) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Hungary | 0.06 | (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.16) | 0.10 | (0.19) | -3 | (16.3) | -8 | (11.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.24 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | C | c | C | c |
|  | Ireland | 0.52 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.31 | (0.06) | 8 | (6.0) | -4 | (5.5) |
|  | Italy | 0.23 | (0.03) | 0.24 | (0.13) | -0.01 | (0.13) | -19 | (23.9) | -19 | (24.8) |
|  | Japan | 0.32 | (0.03) | 0.37 | (0.07) | -0.05 | (0.08) | -34 | (11.3) | -28 | (8.6) |
|  | Korea | 0.59 | (0.06) | 0.24 | (0.06) | 0.35 | (0.10) | -3 | (11.7) | -27 | (10.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.12 | (0.02) | 0.42 | (0.05) | -0.30 | (0.05) | -11 | (5.2) | 5 | (5.0) |
|  | Mexico | 0.22 | (0.05) | 0.66 | (0.15) | -0.44 | (0.16) | 21 | (9.3) | 33 | (7.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.40 | (0.10) | 0.30 | (0.05) | 0.10 | (0.12) | 2 | (16.3) | -8 | (13.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.16 | (0.03) | 0.24 | (0.13) | -0.08 | (0.13) | -25 | (14.4) | -21 | (11.8) |
|  | Norway | 0.29 | (0.03) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Poland | 0.18 | (0.04) | C | C | c | C | C | C | C | C |
|  | Portugal | 0.35 | (0.07) | 0.99 | (0.41) | -0.64 | (0.43) | -21 | (10.8) | -5 | (13.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.05 | (0.05) | 0.27 | (0.17) | -0.22 | (0.18) | -4 | (18.6) | 7 | (16.0) |
|  | Spain | 0.37 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.08) | 0.04 | (0.11) | -5 | (5.3) | -5 | (5.4) |
|  | Sweden | 0.17 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.13) | 0.14 | (0.14) | -13 | (10.8) | -17 | (8.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.39 | (0.04) | 0.53 | (0.13) | -0.14 | (0.14) | -4 | (24.4) | 4 | (24.6) |
|  | Turkey | -0.28 | (0.07) | C | c | c | C | c | C | C | c |
|  | United States | 0.10 | (0.05) | 0.25 | (0.16) | -0.15 | (0.19) | 16 | (11.5) | 21 | (12.4) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.23 | (0.01) | 0.32 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.04) | -8 | (3.0) | -6 | (2.9) |
| む | Brazil | 0.35 | (0.05) | 0.06 | (0.13) | 0.29 | (0.15) | 24 | (12.9) | 13 | (11.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.48 | (0.17) | 0.49 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.17) | 12 | (13.8) | 13 | (14.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.03 | (0.08) | 0.11 | (0.11) | -0.07 | (0.14) | -23 | (10.4) | -21 | (8.9) |
|  | Latvia | 0.08 | (0.04) | c | c | c | C | c | C | c | C |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.58 | (0.07) | C | c | C | C | C | C | C | C |
|  | Macao-China | c | C | c | C | C | C | c | C | C | C |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.50 | (0.04) | c | c | c | C | c | C | C | C |
|  | Thailand | 0.55 | (0.06) | 0.22 | (0.17) | 0.33 | (0.18) | 35 | (13.5) | 29 | (13.0) |
|  | Tunisia | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Uruguay | -0.20 | (0.05) | 0.07 | (0.10) | -0.27 | (0.11) | 0 | (8.8) | 14 | (8.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

[Part 1/1]
National assessments at the lower Table IV.4.20 secondary level


Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may
experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions.

1. A national assessment has been organised every year up to 2013, but
exceptionally not in 2009.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2011). For further
notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011.
. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.
StatLink (anisम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498

National assessments at the upper Table IV.4.21 secondary level


Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. 1. A national assessment has been organised every year up to 2013, but exceptionally not in 2009.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2011). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011.
PISA system-level data collection in 2013
StatLink 匐正म http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
［Part 1／2］
Table IV．4．22 National examinations at the lower secondary level


Levels of government（Column 2）
1：Central authority or government
2：State authorities or government
3：Provincial／regional authorities or governments
4：Sub－regional or inter－municipal authorities or governments
5：Local authorities or governments
6：School，school board or committe
Note：Federal states or countries with hig
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
Sources：a．Education at a Glance 2012：OECD Indicators（OECD，2012）．For further notes，see Annex 3，available on line：www．oecd．org／edu／eag2012
b．PISA system－level data collection in 2013.
StatLink 弃正经 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957498

Percentage of students taking national examinations（Column 5）
1：All students
2：Between 76\％and 99\％of student
3：Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of student
4：Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
5：Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6： $10 \%$ or less of students
［Part 2／2］
Table IV．4．22 National examinations at the lower secondary level

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { تٍ } \\ & \text { ジ } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Year of reference | Type of programme |  |  | Standardised at the national level | Compulsory for students |  | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む } \\ & \text { ثِ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | шоолssер чبм К Крәәлир рәлечя |  |  |  |
|  |  | （1） |  |  | （2） | （3） | （4） | （5） | （6） | （7） | （8） | （9） | （10） | （11） | （12） | （13） | （14） | （15） | （16） | （17） | （18） | （19） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Albania |  | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | a | Yes | No | No | a | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| $\stackrel{3}{1}$ | Argentina |  |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ | Brazil | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Cyprus＊ | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Hong Kong－China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | 2012 | All programmes | Yes | 6 | No | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | a | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | a | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
|  | Macao－China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | No | No | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre－voc．and voc． | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | Yes Yes | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | No No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | Yes <br> Yes | Yes <br> Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Romania | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | m | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | a | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
|  | Serbia |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai－China | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre－voc．and voc． | Yes <br> No | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \mathrm{a} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | Yes a | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & \mathrm{a} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \mathrm{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | Yes a | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \mathrm{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \mathrm{a} \end{gathered}$ | Yes a | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2 | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 1 | Yes | No | 4 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | a | No | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre－voc．and voc． | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | Yes Yes | Yes <br> Yes | Yes <br> Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |

Levels of government（Column 2）
1：Central authority or government
2：State authorities or government
3：Provincial／regional authorities or governments
4：Sub－regional or inter－municipal authorities or governments
5．Local authorities or governments
5：Local authorities or governments
6：School，school board or committee

Percentage of students taking national examinations（Column 5）
1：All students
2：Between $76 \%$ and $99 \%$ of students
2．Between 76\％and 99\％of students
3：Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of student
4：Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
5：Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6： $10 \%$ or less of students

Note：Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states，provinces or regions．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
Sources：a．Education at a Glance 2012：OECD Indicators（OECD，2012）．For further notes，see Annex 3，available on line：www．oecd．org／edu／eag2012．
b．PISA system－level data collection in 2013

[Part 1/2]
Table IV.4.23 National examinations at the upper secondary level


Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or governmen
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments

Percentage of students taking national examinations (Column 5)
1: All students
2: Between $76 \%$ and $99 \%$ of students
3: Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of students
4: Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
: Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students

6: School, school board or committee
Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions.

1. Excludes ISCED 3C programmes, includes ISCED 3A vocational programmes only.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

[Part 2/2]
Table IV.4.23 National examinations at the upper secondary level


Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments
6: School, school board or committee

Percentage of students taking national examinations (Column 5)
1: All students
2: Between 76\% and 99\% of students
3: Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of students
4: Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
5: Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6: $10 \%$ or less of students

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions.

1. Excludes ISCED 3C programmes, includes ISCED 3A vocational programmes only.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

StatLink 荃ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 1/2]
Table IV.4.24
Other (non-national) standardised examinations administered in multiple lower secondary schools

|  |  | U | Year of reference | Type of programme |  |  |  | Percentage of students taking them | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\ddagger}{ \pm}$ |  |  |  |  | Shared directly with students | е!рәш чи!м Крәапр ралечя |
|  |  |  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Austria | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Belgium (Fl.) | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Belgium (Fr.) | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 2 | No | 3 | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Canada |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Chile | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Czech Republic | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Denmark | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | England | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Estonia | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Finland | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | France | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Germany | a | 2011 | General Pre-voc. and voc. | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{a} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { a } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{a} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{a} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Greece | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Hungary | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Iceland | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Ireland | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Israel | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Italy | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Japan | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 3 | No | m | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Korea |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Luxembourg | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Mexico | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Netherlands | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | New Zealand |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Norway | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 5 | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Poland | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Portugal | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Scotland | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Slovak Republic | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Slovenia |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Spain | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Sweden | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Switzerland | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 2; 6 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Turkey | a | 2011 | All programmes | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | United States | a | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | m | m | m | Yes | m | m | m | m | No | No | Yes | No | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Levels of govern <br> 1: Central author <br> 2: State authoriti <br> 3: Provincial/regi <br> 4: Sub-regional or <br> 5: Local authoriti <br> 6: School, school <br> 7: Private compa | colu over ver mu or | mn 2) <br> rnment <br> nments <br> rities or <br> nicipal <br> rnment <br> commi | or governments authorities or gov s ttee | nmen |  |  |  |  | Per 1: 2: 3: 4: 5: 6: | All stud | e of sts ents n $76 \%$ $51 \%$ $26 \%$ $11 \%$ less | tudents t and 99 $\%$ and 75 $\%$ and 50 and 25 ftuden | aking $\%$ of $\%$ of $\%$ \% of ts | non-n tudent tudent tudent tudent | tiona | exam | nation | s (Colu | $m n 4)$ |  |  |
|  | Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions. <br> * See notes at the beginning of this Annex. <br> Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012. <br> b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013. <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Table IV.4.24 Other (non-national) standardised examinations administered in multiple lower secondary schools

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{y y y}{u} \\ \dot{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  | Type of programme |  |  | şuapmis nof Kuos\|nduoo |  | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Student expulsion from school |  |  |  |  |  |  | Shared directly with students |  |
|  |  | (1) |  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
|  | Albania |  | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| E | Argentina |  |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\widetilde{\sim}$ | Brazil | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Bulgaria | b | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Colombia | b | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Cyprus* | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Hong Kong-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Jordan | b | 2012 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 6 | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Macao-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Qatar | b | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | 4 a | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Romania | b | 2011 | All programmes | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Serbia |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | b | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 3 | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Uruguay | b | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Viet Nam | b | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments
6: School, school board or committee
7: Private company

Percentage of students taking non-national examinations (Column 4)
1: All students
2: Between $76 \%$ and $99 \%$ of students
3: Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of students
4: Between 26\% and $50 \%$ of students
5 : Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6: $10 \%$ or less of students

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

StatLink 完isk http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 1/2]
Table IV.4.25 Other (non-national) standardised examinations administered in multiple upper secondary schools


Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments
6: School, school board or committee
7: Private company

Percentage of students taking non-national examinations (Column 4
1: All students
2: Between $76 \%$ and $99 \%$ of students
3: Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of students
4: Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
5 : Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6: $10 \%$ or less of students

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions.

1. Includes ISCED 3C programmes only.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

[Part 2/2]
Table IV.4.25 Other (non-national) standardised examinations administered in multiple upper secondary schools

|  |  | Hy |  | Type of programme |  |  | Compulsory for students |  | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Student expulsion from school |  | 㐫 |  |  |  | Shared directly with parents |  |  |
|  |  | (1) |  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| 先 | Albania |  | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Argentina |  |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Brazil | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Cyprus* | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Hong Kong-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Jordan | b | 2012 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | b | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | Yes | 6 | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Macao-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Peru | b | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| Qatar |  | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | m | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & \mathrm{a} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \mathrm{a} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { No } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { a } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Romania | b | 2011 | All programmes | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Serbia |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Yes } \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 2011 | All programmes | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | 2011 | General <br> Pre-voc. and voc. | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or government
5: Local authorities or governments
6: School, school board or committee
7: Private company
Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions.

1. Includes ISCED 3C programmes only.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013

[Part 1/2]
Entrance examinations to enter the first stage of tertiary education
Entrance examinations that are not administered by upper secondary schools to access tertiary-type $A$
Table IV.4.26 and tertiary-type B programmes

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y y y}{u} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Shared directly with parents |  | Shared directly with media |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) |
| O Australia | a | 2011 | 3 | 1 | Yes | No | m | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| ${ }_{0}$ Austria | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 5 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
| Belgium (FI.) | a | 2011 | 3 | 2; 6 | Yes | No | m | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Belgium (Fr.) | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Canada |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Chile | a | 2011 | 1 | 6 | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Czech Republic | a | 2011 | 2 | 6 | No | No | m | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Denmark | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
| England | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Estonia | a | 2011 | 2 | 6 | No | No | m | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | m | m | m | Yes | m |
| Finland | a | 2011 | 2 | 6 | No | No | 2 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| France | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Germany | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | m | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Greece | a | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2 | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Hungary | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Iceland | a | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| Ireland | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | Yes | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | m | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Israel | a | 2011 | 2 | 6 | Yes | Yes ${ }^{1}$ | 2 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Italy | a | 2011 | 2 | 1;6 | No | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Japan | a | 2011 | 1 | 6 | No | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | m | m | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Korea | a | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | No | 2 | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Luxembourg | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | Yes | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Mexico | a | 2011 | 1 | 6 | No | Yes | m | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
| Netherlands | a | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| New Zealand |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Norway | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Poland | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | m | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Portugal | a | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| Scotland | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | m | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Slovak Republic | a | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | m | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Slovenia |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Spain | a | 2011 | 2 |  | Yes | Yes ${ }^{2}$ | 3 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sweden | a | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | No | m | No | No | No | Yes | No | m | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Switzerland | a | 2011 | 3 | 2; 6 | No | No | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Turkey | a | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| United States | a | 2011 | 2 | 7 | Yes | No | 4 | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Existence of tertiary entrance examinations (Column 1)
1: Yes, for all fields of study
2: Yes, for most (more than half) fields of study
3: Yes, for some fields of study
4: No
Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2. Sentral authority or governmen
2. Provincial/regional authorities

3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments
6: Individual tertiary institute or consortium of tertiary institutes
7: Private company
Notes: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions
Tertiary-type A programmes refer to university-level education (ISCED 5A) and tertiary-type B programmes refer to vocationally oriented tertiary education (ISCED 5B).

1. Except to access ISCED 5B tertiary programmes.
2. Except to access ISCED 5B tertiary programmes after completion of general upper secondary education.
3. Except to access ISCED 5B tertiary progr

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

Percentage of students taking entrance examinations (Column 5)
1: All students
2: Between $76 \%$ and $99 \%$ of students
3: Between $51 \%$ and $75 \%$ of students
4: Between $26 \%$ and $50 \%$ of students
5: Between $11 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students
6: $10 \%$ or less of students
[Part 2/2]
Entrance examinations to enter the first stage of tertiary education
Entrance examinations that are not administered by upper secondary schools to access tertiary-type $A$
Table IV.4.26 and tertiary-type B programmes

|  |  | E゙ٍٍ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Main purposes or uses |  |  |  |  |  | How results are shared |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (1) |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) |
| 慈 | Albania |  | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | Yes | No | 6 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | a | Yes | Yes | m | m | Yes | Yes |
|  | Argentina |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Brazil | a | 2011 | 1 | 1;6 | Yes | No | 2 | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 6 | No | Yes | m | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | Yes | No | 3 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Cyprus* | $b$ | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Hong Kong- China | $b$ | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2011 | 1 | 6 | No | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | a | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | Yes | No | 6 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | Yes | Yes | 5 | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | a | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Macao-China | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 6 | No | Yes | m | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 1 | No | 4 | 4 | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 2011 | 2 | 6 | No | Yes | m | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 2 | Yes | Yes | , | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Romania | $b$ | 2011 | 2 | 6 | m | Yes | m | Yes | a | Yes | Yes | No | a | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Serbia |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 2 | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2011 | 4 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | No | 3 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2011 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 1 | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 2011 | 3 | 6 | No | No | 6 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | a | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | 2011 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Existence of tertiary entrance examinations (Column 1)
1: Yes, for all fields of study
2: Yes, for most (more than half) fields of study
3: Yes, for some fields of study
4: No
Levels of government (Column 2)
1: Central authority or government
2: State authorities or governments
3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
5: Local authorities or governments
6: Individual tertiary institute or consortium of tertiary institutes
6: Individual tertiary
Notes: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions
Tertiary-type A programmes refer to university-level education (ISCED 5A) and tertiary-type B programmes refer to vocationally oriented tertiary education (ISCED 5B).

1. Except to access ISCED 5B tertiary programmes.
2. Except to access ISCED 5B tertiary programmes after completion of general upper secondary education.

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013

StatLink (ainst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 1/2]
Factors, criteria or special circumstances used by tertiary institutions to determine admission Factors, criteria or special circumstances (other than examinations) used by tertiary institutions to determine access
Table IV.4.27 to tertiary-type A and tertiary-type B programmes


Levels of importance (Columns 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17)
1: No importance
2: Low level of importance
3: Moderate level of importance
4: High level of importance
Notes: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions
Tertiary-type A programmes refer to university-level education (ISCED 5A) and tertiary-type B programmes refer to vocationally oriented tertiary education (ISCED 5B).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013

StatLink (讠inाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 2/2]
Factors, criteria or special circumstances used by tertiary institutions to determine admission Factors, criteria or special circumstances (other than examinations) used by tertiary institutions to determine access Table IV.4.27 to tertiary-type A and tertiary-type B programmes

|  |  |  |  |  | Grade point average from secondary schools |  | Ethnicity of applicant |  | Family income of applicant |  | Previous work experience |  | Past service or volunteer work |  | Recommendations |  | Applicant letter or written rationale to justify admission |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (1) |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) |
|  | Albania |  | $b$ | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| E | Argentina |  |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Brazil | a | 2011 | Yes | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | m |
|  | Bulgaria | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a |
|  | Colombia | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | No | a | Yes | 3 | m | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 4 |
|  | Costa Rica |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Croatia | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | a | a |
|  | Cyprus* | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | No | a | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a |
|  | Hong Kong-China | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 3 |
|  | Indonesia | a | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Jordan | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | Yes | 4 | No | 1 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a |
|  | Kazakhstan |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Latvia | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | No | a |
|  | Liechtenstein | $b$ | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Lithuania | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 2 | No | a | No | a | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | No | a | No | a | No | a |
|  | Macao-China | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | Yes | 4 | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes | 2 | No | a |
|  | Malaysia | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes | 3 | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 |
|  | Montenegro | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 3 | No | 1 | No | 1 | Yes | 4 | No | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | No | a |
|  | Peru | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 3 | No | a | No | a | Yes | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes | 3 | No | a | No | a |
|  | Qatar | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | No | a | Yes | 3 | No | a | Yes | 2 | Yes | 3 | Yes | 2 | No | a |
|  | Romania | $b$ | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Russian Federation | a | 2011 | Yes | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 4 |
|  | Serbia |  |  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Shanghai-China | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | 3 | No | a | No | a | Yes | 1 | Yes | 3 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 4 |
|  | Singapore | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 4 |
|  | Chinese Taipei | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | Yes | 2 |
|  | Thailand | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 2 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a |
|  | Tunisia | $b$ | 2011 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | United Arab Emirates | $b$ | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | , | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Uruguay | $b$ | 2011 | No | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
|  | Viet Nam | $b$ | 2011 | Yes | Yes | 4 | Yes | 2 | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a | No | a |

Levels of importance (Columns 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17)
1: No importance
2: Low level of importance
3: Moderate level of importance
4: High level of importance
Notes: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions.
Tertiary-type A programmes refer to university-level education (ISCED 5A) and tertiary-type B programmes refer to vocationally oriented tertiary education (ISCED 5B).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

Sources: a. Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators (OECD, 2012). For further notes, see Annex 3, available on line: www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.
b. PISA system-level data collection in 2013.

StatLink (aitा
[Part 1/2]
Assessment practices
Table IV.4.30 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds are used |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | To inform parents about their child's progress |  | To make decisions about students' retention or promotion |  | To group students for instructional purposes |  | To compare the school to district or national performance |  | To monitor the school's progress from year to year |  | To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness |  | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved |  | To compare the school with other schools |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| 0 | Australia | 100.0 | (0.0) | 62.8 | (1.8) | 83.5 | (1.3) | 56.4 | (1.9) | 87.6 | (1.3) | 49.8 | (1.8) | 90.9 | (1.1) | 44.3 | (2.0) |
|  | Austria | 95.5 | (1.7) | 94.2 | (1.7) | 30.5 | (2.4) | 28.5 | (4.0) | 62.6 | (4.2) | 39.1 | (4.1) | 69.6 | (3.6) | 30.0 | (4.1) |
|  | Belgium | 96.6 | (1.3) | 96.2 | (1.3) | 17.2 | (2.3) | 23.3 | (2.6) | 59.8 | (3.2) | 35.2 | (3.0) | 73.1 | (3.0) | 18.3 | (2.3) |
|  | Canada | 99.7 | (0.2) | 95.0 | (1.2) | 74.1 | (2.1) | 82.3 | (1.5) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 30.2 | (1.9) | 86.6 | (1.5) | 62.0 | (2.3) |
|  | Chile | 100.0 | c | 88.9 | (2.5) | 43.6 | (4.1) | 53.7 | (4.1) | 93.6 | (1.8) | 61.3 | (3.5) | 91.7 | (2.0) | 38.5 | (4.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 93.1 | (1.7) | 79.4 | (2.9) | 32.8 | (3.3) | 58.2 | (3.2) | 86.2 | (2.7) | 62.8 | (3.4) | 86.3 | (2.7) | 63.1 | (3.2) |
|  | Denmark | 99.2 | (0.4) | 10.3 | (1.9) | 52.3 | (3.4) | 54.9 | (3.5) | 56.8 | (3.3) | 27.1 | (3.1) | 84.7 | (2.4) | 55.9 | (3.5) |
|  | Estonia | 99.5 | (0.5) | 82.0 | (2.4) | 20.7 | (2.6) | 64.7 | (2.8) | 78.0 | (2.4) | 65.5 | (3.0) | 83.1 | (2.2) | 58.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Finland | 98.7 | (0.3) | 93.3 | (1.6) | 17.0 | (2.5) | 45.8 | (3.4) | 59.5 | (3.5) | 15.5 | (2.2) | 60.5 | (3.6) | 21.1 | (2.7) |
|  | France | 97.2 | (1.1) | 96.4 | (1.3) | 42.7 | (3.4) | 62.2 | (2.9) | 73.2 | (3.1) | 22.6 | (3.0) | 50.4 | (3.5) | 40.6 | (3.4) |
|  | Germany | 95.9 | (1.5) | 95.8 | (1.5) | 39.5 | (3.2) | 43.4 | (3.3) | 57.2 | (3.7) | 24.2 | (3.2) | 60.8 | (3.6) | 27.7 | (3.1) |
|  | Greece | 100.0 | c | 98.2 | (1.0) | 8.1 | (2.4) | 17.0 | (2.4) | 55.9 | (3.6) | 14.0 | (2.4) | 49.4 | (3.6) | 21.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Hungary | 93.9 | (1.8) | 69.2 | (3.7) | 47.1 | (3.6) | 78.5 | (3.3) | 92.6 | (2.0) | 57.8 | (3.9) | 77.4 | (3.0) | 71.3 | (3.9) |
|  | Iceland | 100.0 | c | 15.0 | (0.2) | 42.4 | (0.3) | 77.1 | (0.2) | 89.2 | (0.1) | 39.1 | (0.2) | 92.8 | (0.1) | 73.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 100.0 | c | 62.0 | (4.0) | 81.4 | (2.9) | 77.3 | (3.3) | 86.4 | (2.7) | 46.5 | (4.1) | 68.4 | (3.9) | 35.2 | (4.0) |
|  | Israel | 100.0 | c | 81.5 | (2.9) | 97.2 | (1.3) | 65.5 | (3.4) | 95.3 | (1.7) | 81.7 | (3.2) | 91.7 | (2.4) | 53.7 | (4.1) |
|  | Italy | 99.3 | (0.4) | 86.6 | (1.8) | 53.4 | (2.0) | 65.1 | (2.2) | 82.0 | (1.6) | 29.6 | (1.9) | 91.7 | (1.2) | 36.6 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | 99.2 | (0.6) | 90.4 | (2.1) | 45.3 | (3.5) | 17.3 | (2.5) | 51.6 | (3.5) | 75.7 | (3.0) | 79.2 | (2.9) | 14.9 | (2.6) |
|  | Korea | 94.7 | (1.9) | 56.3 | (4.2) | 85.6 | (2.8) | 70.2 | (3.6) | 89.9 | (2.6) | 85.3 | (3.0) | 96.3 | (1.6) | 66.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 95.4 | (0.0) | 94.2 | (0.1) | 41.2 | (0.1) | 74.2 | (0.1) | 72.3 | (0.1) | 22.3 | (0.1) | 73.8 | (0.1) | 39.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 99.0 | (0.3) | 91.5 | (1.2) | 72.8 | (1.7) | 77.1 | (1.5) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 76.7 | (1.3) | 88.4 | (1.2) | 70.6 | (1.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 99.3 | (0.9) | 97.7 | (1.1) | 61.0 | (3.7) | 69.7 | (4.1) | 88.8 | (2.7) | 68.4 | (3.9) | 78.1 | (3.5) | 64.1 | (4.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 100.0 | c | 76.7 | (3.3) | 93.6 | (2.1) | 92.8 | (2.7) | 100.0 | c | 67.7 | (3.8) | 99.4 | (0.5) | 87.5 | (3.4) |
|  | Norway | 98.3 | (1.0) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 47.9 | (3.3) | 68.2 | (3.0) | 83.8 | (2.7) | 30.2 | (3.3) | 73.8 | (3.2) | 51.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Poland | 99.2 | (0.7) | 97.7 | (1.2) | 55.0 | (3.8) | 58.2 | (3.6) | 96.3 | (1.5) | 78.9 | (3.0) | 95.4 | (1.7) | 59.4 | (3.9) |
|  | Portugal | 100.0 | c | 98.2 | (1.1) | 40.3 | (4.6) | 85.0 | (3.5) | 95.9 | (1.6) | 50.5 | (3.6) | 93.5 | (2.1) | 63.2 | (4.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 100.0 | c | 93.4 | (1.4) | 38.2 | (3.4) | 64.2 | (3.5) | 70.7 | (3.9) | 69.0 | (3.3) | 83.0 | (2.6) | 69.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Slovenia | 98.0 | (0.1) | 92.7 | (0.3) | 26.2 | (0.9) | 58.7 | (0.6) | 91.5 | (0.3) | 38.2 | (0.9) | 72.1 | (0.6) | 46.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Spain | 99.5 | (0.4) | 94.6 | (0.9) | 47.2 | (3.3) | 44.0 | (2.5) | 88.5 | (1.8) | 50.1 | (2.8) | 93.7 | (1.2) | 36.9 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | 93.9 | (1.8) | 43.0 | (4.0) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 89.8 | (2.3) | 96.2 | (1.4) | 43.6 | (3.6) | 83.9 | (2.6) | 84.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Switzerland | 93.7 | (1.8) | 85.7 | (2.4) | 40.1 | (3.1) | 41.1 | (3.2) | 48.0 | (3.4) | 36.4 | (3.8) | 50.7 | (3.7) | 27.5 | (3.6) |
|  | Turkey | 97.1 | (1.5) | 55.3 | (4.1) | 44.1 | (4.0) | 74.9 | (3.7) | 92.6 | (1.9) | 70.8 | (3.7) | 68.5 | (3.6) | 84.9 | (2.9) |
|  | United Kingdom | 99.4 | (0.7) | 68.9 | (3.5) | 96.3 | (0.9) | 96.0 | (1.3) | 99.7 | (0.2) | 88.2 | (2.1) | 96.2 | (1.4) | 90.3 | (2.2) |
|  | United States | 98.7 | (1.0) | 56.8 | (4.2) | 74.3 | (3.7) | 93.6 | (2.6) | 95.2 | (2.0) | 59.9 | (4.2) | 94.1 | (1.6) | 86.3 | (2.9) |
|  | OECD average | 98.1 | (0.2) | 76.5 | (0.4) | 50.5 | (0.5) | 62.6 | (0.5) | 81.2 | (0.4) | 50.4 | (0.5) | 80.3 | (0.4) | 52.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Albania | 99.3 | (0.6) | 77.5 | (2.8) | 73.9 | (3.3) | 76.7 | (3.5) | 91.0 | (2.3) | 86.8 | (3.1) | 87.4 | (2.8) | 78.1 | (3.3) |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | Argentina | 91.0 | (2.5) | 87.2 | (2.7) | 24.3 | (3.1) | 22.3 | (3.4) | 73.9 | (3.6) | 50.7 | (3.7) | 94.0 | (1.4) | 7.2 | (2.2) |
| ® | Brazil | 97.0 | (0.9) | 91.2 | (1.6) | 47.0 | (2.4) | 83.2 | (1.9) | 97.0 | (0.8) | 79.9 | (2.0) | 88.7 | (1.5) | 56.4 | (2.5) |
|  | Bulgaria | 99.1 | (0.7) | 65.1 | (3.8) | 39.3 | (3.6) | 86.1 | (2.9) | 94.9 | (1.8) | 93.2 | (2.0) | 71.8 | (3.6) | 85.4 | (2.9) |
|  | Colombia | 99.5 | (0.6) | 92.9 | (2.1) | 43.6 | (3.9) | 68.1 | (4.0) | 94.0 | (1.8) | 59.6 | (3.9) | 95.1 | (1.8) | 63.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Costa Rica | 97.6 | (0.9) | 91.1 | (2.1) | 37.1 | (3.5) | 65.1 | (3.5) | 86.1 | (2.4) | 71.2 | (3.7) | 84.7 | (3.0) | 50.3 | (3.7) |
|  | Croatia | 100.0 | c | 88.3 | (2.4) | 51.5 | (4.4) | 65.7 | (3.9) | 94.6 | (1.7) | 55.9 | (3.8) | 84.5 | (3.0) | 62.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Cyprus* | 100.0 | c | 98.8 | (0.0) | 28.0 | (0.1) | 15.4 | (0.1) | 66.7 | (0.1) | 38.1 | (0.1) | 61.9 | (0.1) | 14.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 98.1 | (1.1) | 98.1 | (1.1) | 86.4 | (2.9) | 44.1 | (4.7) | 96.1 | (1.7) | 80.0 | (3.5) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 30.5 | (3.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 97.1 | (1.7) | 92.8 | (2.1) | 79.6 | (3.2) | 69.0 | (4.3) | 98.1 | (1.3) | 95.8 | (2.1) | 97.1 | (1.6) | 86.9 | (2.9) |
|  | Jordan | 97.3 | (1.4) | 92.1 | (2.1) | 80.7 | (2.9) | 70.2 | (3.0) | 85.4 | (2.4) | 72.3 | (3.4) | 88.8 | (2.4) | 55.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 99.8 | (0.2) | 95.3 | (1.6) | 65.5 | (3.8) | 91.8 | (2.3) | 99.8 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 98.8 | (0.8) | 90.6 | (2.1) |
|  | Latvia | 100.0 | c | 96.9 | (1.2) | 38.1 | (3.5) | 92.5 | (1.6) | 99.8 | (0.2) | 92.5 | (1.8) | 99.6 | (0.5) | 85.5 | (2.3) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 100.0 | c | 71.8 | (1.4) | 49.1 | (1.2) | 68.1 | (1.4) | 66.8 | (1.0) | 20.2 | (1.2) | 69.5 | (1.5) | 59.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Lithuania | 99.5 | (0.6) | 84.6 | (2.6) | 53.1 | (3.5) | 61.4 | (3.4) | 94.1 | (1.8) | 73.9 | (3.0) | 82.1 | (2.6) | 59.7 | (3.2) |
|  | Macao-China | 99.4 | (0.0) | 94.9 | (0.0) | 65.2 | (0.1) | 31.9 | (0.0) | 86.7 | (0.1) | 75.3 | (0.1) | 96.5 | (0.0) | 21.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 98.8 | (0.9) | 52.8 | (3.7) | 87.2 | (2.7) | 80.8 | (3.0) | 97.7 | (1.0) | 92.0 | (2.2) | 96.7 | (1.5) | 67.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Montenegro | 97.3 | (0.0) | 81.0 | (0.1) | 38.9 | (0.2) | 78.6 | (0.1) | 96.3 | (0.0) | 91.5 | (0.1) | 89.3 | (0.1) | 64.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 97.8 | (1.1) | 88.2 | (2.0) | 45.0 | (3.4) | 40.9 | (3.4) | 84.5 | (2.7) | 77.9 | (2.8) | 93.1 | (2.0) | 37.6 | (3.9) |
|  | Qatar | 96.9 | (0.0) | 87.7 | (0.1) | 86.4 | (0.1) | 82.6 | (0.1) | 96.1 | (0.0) | 87.0 | (0.1) | 97.4 | (0.0) | 81.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 77.2 | (2.8) | 70.3 | (3.7) | 57.4 | (3.8) | 67.6 | (3.8) | 72.4 | (3.5) | 74.8 | (3.2) | 76.5 | (3.0) | 69.1 | (3.9) |
|  | Russian Federation | 99.4 | (0.6) | 94.4 | (1.9) | 56.7 | (4.4) | 93.2 | (1.5) | 99.7 | (0.3) | 99.2 | (0.7) | 99.2 | (0.8) | 97.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Serbia | 98.5 | (1.1) | 83.8 | (3.2) | 35.5 | (4.3) | 34.2 | (4.0) | 95.5 | (1.8) | 57.3 | (4.4) | 86.0 | (2.9) | 57.1 | (4.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 98.0 | (1.0) | 50.9 | (3.4) | 55.0 | (4.0) | 50.1 | (4.2) | 87.5 | (2.5) | 86.4 | (2.7) | 95.8 | (1.6) | 56.7 | (3.9) |
|  | Singapore | 100.0 | c | 88.4 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.0) | 95.5 | (0.8) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 87.7 | (0.8) | 98.2 | (0.0) | 88.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 95.6 | (1.7) | 45.4 | (3.2) | 35.0 | (3.9) | 36.6 | (3.9) | 78.2 | (3.4) | 47.9 | (3.6) | 94.2 | (1.7) | 41.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Thailand | 99.5 | (0.5) | 86.1 | (2.8) | 79.4 | (2.9) | 85.2 | (2.1) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 91.0 | (2.1) | 95.8 | (1.5) | 75.6 | (3.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 80.0 | (3.4) | 95.4 | (1.9) | 51.6 | (4.4) | 70.7 | (4.0) | 89.1 | (2.6) | 67.1 | (4.1) | 55.9 | (4.3) | 69.1 | (4.4) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 100.0 | (0.0) | 90.5 | (1.5) | 87.2 | (2.0) | 77.1 | (2.6) | 96.4 | (1.4) | 94.3 | (1.1) | 97.1 | (0.7) | 72.3 | (2.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 95.0 | (1.6) | 92.1 | (1.7) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 16.5 | (2.8) | 87.5 | (2.3) | 31.2 | (3.6) | 86.3 | (2.5) | 12.2 | (2.3) |
|  | Viet Nam | 99.3 | (0.7) | 95.5 | (1.6) | 74.2 | (3.6) | 88.7 | (2.7) | 98.3 | (1.0) | 99.2 | (0.7) | 91.2 | (2.2) | 87.5 | (2.7) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Assessment practices
Table IV.4.30 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Index of assessment practices (sum of "yes" responses to the eight purposes) |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds are used for: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None of the eight purposes | One of the eight purposes |  | Two of the eight purposes |  | Three of the eight purposes |  | Four of the eight purposes |  | Five of the eight purposes |  | Six or more of the eight purposes |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | 4.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.8 | (0.3) | 3.7 | (0.8) | 12.6 | (1.6) | 21.7 | (2.0) | 28.3 | (2.1) | 32.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Austria | 4.0 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (1.2) | 2.6 | (1.4) | 14.7 | (3.1) | 18.0 | (3.3) | 23.0 | (3.6) | 21.8 | (3.8) | 18.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Belgium | 3.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 17.8 | (2.6) | 23.5 | (3.2) | 27.0 | (3.0) | 19.8 | (2.6) | 12.0 | (2.3) |
|  | Canada | 5.1 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 6.2 | (1.0) | 12.1 | (2.0) | 29.5 | (3.1) | 48.8 | (3.4) |
|  | Chile | 4.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.4 | (1.5) | 8.0 | (2.5) | 27.3 | (4.2) | 25.5 | (4.4) | 36.8 | (4.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 4.5 | (0.2) | 4.8 | (1.6) | 1.0 | (0.8) | 4.1 | (1.7) | 12.5 | (3.8) | 14.6 | (3.0) | 29.9 | (4.3) | 33.1 | (5.0) |
|  | Denmark | 3.9 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 3.8 | (1.5) | 9.4 | (2.2) | 28.0 | (3.0) | 20.5 | (3.3) | 21.9 | (2.8) | 15.8 | (2.9) |
|  | Estonia | 4.4 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.0) | 9.4 | (2.2) | 20.7 | (3.2) | 12.5 | (2.6) | 25.3 | (3.1) | 30.4 | (3.2) |
|  | Finland | 3.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 26.4 | (3.8) | 24.2 | (3.0) | 19.9 | (3.0) | 13.2 | (2.3) |
|  | France | 4.2 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 8.1 | (2.0) | 22.5 | (3.3) | 23.9 | (3.3) | 24.8 | (3.4) | 18.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Germany | 4.0 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 1.6 | (0.9) | 13.2 | (2.7) | 21.1 | (2.4) | 25.5 | (3.5) | 18.1 | (3.0) | 19.7 | (2.9) |
|  | Greece | 3.4 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (0.8) | 29.2 | (3.8) | 29.2 | (3.5) | 19.6 | (2.8) | 12.1 | (2.7) | 8.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Hungary | 4.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.2) | 13.3 | (3.5) | 23.6 | (4.7) | 26.8 | (4.8) | 36.0 | (4.7) |
|  | Iceland | 4.8 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 1.1 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 10.4 | (0.2) | 19.5 | (0.2) | 35.6 | (0.3) | 30.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 4.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.5) | 2.3 | (1.3) | 8.2 | (2.7) | 19.3 | (3.6) | 30.2 | (4.1) | 38.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Israel | 5.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 3.6 | (2.5) | 3.7 | (2.2) | 16.9 | (4.0) | 19.2 | (4.8) | 56.5 | (6.1) |
|  | Italy | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | (0.0) | 2.5 | (0.6) | 11.6 | (1.5) | 23.5 | (2.0) | 30.0 | (2.5) | 32.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Japan | 4.3 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.9 | (1.0) | 9.2 | (2.4) | 14.1 | (2.7) | 25.3 | (3.2) | 30.6 | (3.9) | 18.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Korea | 4.8 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 4.7 | (2.7) | 3.7 | (2.6) | 7.2 | (2.5) | 11.4 | (4.1) | 33.1 | (5.9) | 39.8 | (6.6) |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.4 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 14.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 31.7 | (0.1) | 33.4 | (0.1) | 19.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 1.9 | (0.6) | 5.9 | (1.2) | 19.6 | (2.4) | 28.0 | (3.1) | 43.8 | (3.0) |
|  | Netherlands | 4.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (1.8) | 2.7 | (1.8) | 14.9 | (4.2) | 16.3 | (4.9) | 26.0 | (4.9) | 37.6 | (5.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 5.8 | (5.7) | 0.0 | c | 30.6 | (9.0) | 63.6 | (9.5) |
|  | Norway | 4.2 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.9) | 7.5 | (2.2) | 6.8 | (2.1) | 11.2 | (2.1) | 22.7 | (3.3) | 27.3 | (3.3) | 23.2 | (3.3) |
|  | Poland | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.7 | (2.6) | 23.0 | (5.2) | 35.4 | (5.9) | 36.9 | (5.3) |
|  | Portugal | 5.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.3) | 3.1 | (1.9) | 14.2 | (4.2) | 31.3 | (5.6) | 49.6 | (5.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 4.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | (1.5) | 5.8 | (2.4) | 11.6 | (3.4) | 20.2 | (4.3) | 28.8 | (4.7) | 30.7 | (4.6) |
|  | Slovenia | 4.6 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 12.4 | (0.4) | 27.5 | (0.7) | 22.7 | (0.6) | 31.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Spain | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.5) | 2.9 | (1.1) | 6.6 | (1.7) | 28.5 | (2.9) | 30.8 | (2.5) | 30.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Sweden | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.7 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 9.8 | (2.6) | 14.7 | (3.2) | 32.6 | (4.4) | 40.6 | (4.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 3.7 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.8) | 3.3 | (1.3) | 15.4 | (2.8) | 23.8 | (3.1) | 26.4 | (3.5) | 16.5 | (2.6) | 13.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Turkey | 4.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.1 | (1.6) | 3.2 | (1.6) | 12.2 | (3.1) | 18.2 | (5.0) | 21.7 | (5.3) | 43.5 | (5.6) |
|  | United Kingdom | 5.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 1.6 | (1.7) | 0.0 | c | 8.0 | (5.8) | 9.5 | (5.2) | 28.7 | (8.3) | 52.1 | (9.1) |
|  | United States | 5.1 | (0.2) | 2.5 | (2.6) | 0.0 | c | 0.9 | (0.9) | 6.3 | (4.8) | 15.5 | (5.2) | 23.0 | (7.4) | 51.7 | (7.1) |
|  | OECD average | 4.6 | (0.0) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 6.3 | (0.3) | 12.8 | (0.5) | 20.0 | (0.6) | 26.4 | (0.7) | 32.6 | (0.8) |


| ๗ | Albania | 4.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (5.6) | 5.5 | (3.1) | 0.0 | c | 7.4 | (4.2) | 27.4 | (6.3) | 43.7 | (7.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 4.2 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (1.2) | 3.4 | (1.1) | 18.7 | (3.5) | 29.5 | (4.1) | 29.2 | (3.4) | 15.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Brazil | 5.0 | (0.1) | 3.5 | (1.7) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 3.8 | (1.3) | 16.0 | (3.1) | 34.7 | (4.4) | 41.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Bulgaria | 5.2 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (1.3) | 0.0 | C | 0.5 | (0.5) | 4.9 | (1.7) | 11.3 | (3.1) | 27.7 | (5.1) | 54.2 | (5.5) |
|  | Colombia | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (1.6) | 7.2 | (3.1) | 18.6 | (3.9) | 31.1 | (5.7) | 41.0 | (5.3) |
|  | Costa Rica | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 2.9 | (1.5) | 5.0 | (1.9) | 9.0 | (2.6) | 11.9 | (2.5) | 29.8 | (5.0) | 40.5 | (4.3) |
|  | Croatia | 4.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 4.6 | (2.0) | 10.2 | (3.3) | 16.7 | (4.1) | 25.0 | (4.7) | 43.5 | (5.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 3.9 | (0.0) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | C | 24.3 | (0.1) | 16.9 | (0.1) | 22.2 | (0.1) | 21.8 | (0.1) | 14.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 5.4 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 2.7 | (1.7) | 13.1 | (3.9) | 26.4 | (4.9) | 57.7 | (5.2) |
|  | Indonesia | 5.4 | (0.2) | 0.0 | C | 4.4 | (4.5) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 9.6 | (5.6) | 23.1 | (7.2) | 62.9 | (8.7) |
|  | Jordan | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.1) | 12.2 | (3.3) | 17.3 | (3.6) | 29.8 | (4.7) | 40.5 | (5.0) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 5.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.8 | (2.0) | 33.4 | (13.3) | 64.8 | (13.5) |
|  | Latvia | 5.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 1.2 | (1.2) | 2.4 | (2.4) | 39.7 | (9.3) | 56.7 | (9.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 5.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 9.8 | (0.8) | 8.5 | (0.6) | 6.8 | (0.9) | 23.8 | (1.5) | 51.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Lithuania | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (0.9) | 2.2 | (1.1) | 6.1 | (2.2) | 13.7 | (3.2) | 33.5 | (4.2) | 42.4 | (4.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 5.1 | (0.0) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 16.1 | (0.1) | 3.9 | (0.0) | 32.5 | (0.1) | 47.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 5.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 1.6 | (1.6) | 0.0 | c | 2.7 | (2.4) | 19.6 | (5.4) | 42.4 | (7.4) | 33.7 | (7.3) |
|  | Montenegro | 5.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 10.9 | (0.1) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 7.2 | (0.3) | 35.1 | (0.2) | 43.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 1.9 | (1.3) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 10.4 | (2.6) | 17.6 | (3.6) | 32.3 | (4.1) | 34.7 | (4.2) |
|  | Qatar | 4.8 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | (0.0) | 8.8 | (0.1) | 6.5 | (0.1) | 13.9 | (0.1) | 32.2 | (0.2) | 37.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 3.9 | (0.2) | 7.0 | (2.8) | 1.4 | (1.1) | 6.3 | (1.9) | 10.2 | (3.3) | 42.9 | (5.0) | 20.2 | (3.9) | 12.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 5.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (3.8) | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | (2.4) | 91.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Serbia | 4.7 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.4 | (0.4) | 2.9 | (1.6) | 12.7 | (3.4) | 26.2 | (4.4) | 29.9 | (4.8) | 27.9 | (4.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 2.2 | (1.5) | 3.7 | (1.9) | 4.1 | (1.7) | 25.1 | (4.3) | 35.8 | (4.8) | 29.1 | (3.8) |
|  | Singapore | 5.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 12.5 | (4.8) | 28.2 | (2.0) | 59.3 | (3.8) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 4.1 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 1.4 | (1.0) | 9.2 | (2.8) | 21.3 | (4.0) | 27.7 | (3.7) | 24.9 | (3.8) | 15.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Thailand | 5.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 12.2 | (4.8) | 5.6 | (3.1) | 21.2 | (6.4) | 61.1 | (9.0) |
|  | Tunisia | 4.8 | (0.1) | 0.0 | C | 2.2 | (1.6) | 5.8 | (2.5) | 7.0 | (2.6) | 23.3 | (4.2) | 20.9 | (4.1) | 40.7 | (5.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 5.4 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 4.4 | (2.1) | 1.6 | (1.3) | 8.8 | (4.2) | 15.9 | (4.1) | 69.2 | (5.8) |
|  | Uruguay | 4.2 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.1 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (1.4) | 19.5 | (2.9) | 37.5 | (3.9) | 22.8 | (3.1) | 15.5 | (2.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | 5.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | (2.9) | 2.1 | (2.1) | 29.6 | (9.1) | 65.4 | (9.3) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Use of achievement data for accountability purposes
Table IV.4.31 Results based on school principals' reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Quality assurance and school improvement
Table IV.4.32 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that their schools have the following measures aimed at quality assurance and improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 96.5 | (0.6) | 90.0 | (1.2) | 98.1 | (0.4) | 94.5 | (0.9) | 69.9 | (1.7) | 69.1 | (1.7) | 92.5 | (1.0) | 72.2 | (1.8) | 76.6 | (1.7) |
| U | Austria | 76.2 | (3.1) | 55.9 | (3.9) | 75.1 | (3.5) | 86.5 | (2.7) | 20.3 | (2.9) | 81.0 | (3.2) | 88.5 | (2.8) | 54.9 | (4.2) | 61.5 | (3.3) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 82.4 | (2.4) | 48.4 | (3.7) | 76.8 | (2.3) | 79.5 | (2.5) | 69.2 | (2.8) | 35.6 | (2.7) | 72.2 | (2.5) | 40.1 | (3.3) | 42.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Canada | 94.7 | (0.9) | 85.3 | (1.7) | 89.8 | (1.1) | 80.9 | (1.7) | 62.0 | (2.1) | 41.8 | (2.4) | 86.0 | (1.5) | 68.8 | (1.5) | 80.1 | (1.9) |
|  | Chile | 83.4 | (2.6) | 76.5 | (2.9) | 86.8 | (2.4) | 89.9 | (2.6) | 55.3 | (3.8) | 49.3 | (4.3) | 20.9 | (3.2) | 40.3 | (3.9) | 49.5 | (3.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 98.5 | (0.7) | 77.1 | (3.0) | 84.7 | (2.7) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 62.9 | (3.8) | 62.6 | (4.1) | 95.9 | (0.8) | 27.3 | (3.0) | 90.2 | (2.4) |
|  | Denmark | 65.6 | (3.6) | 37.8 | (3.5) | 80.2 | (3.2) | 87.6 | (2.4) | 58.3 | (3.7) | 36.6 | (3.3) | 51.7 | (3.5) | 49.7 | (3.2) | 23.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Estonia | 92.5 | (1.6) | 88.3 | (1.8) | 95.5 | (1.2) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 77.1 | (2.3) | 83.4 | (2.0) | 79.9 | (2.4) | 39.2 | (2.9) | 88.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Finland | 94.1 | (1.8) | 75.3 | (3.3) | 74.0 | (2.9) | 95.9 | (1.1) | 51.4 | (3.0) | 74.4 | (3.0) | 55.2 | (3.5) | 10.3 | (2.0) | 63.2 | (2.6) |
|  | France | 71.8 | (3.4) | 24.7 | (3.2) | 74.9 | (2.8) | 60.8 | (3.7) | 51.9 | (3.9) | 13.3 | (2.6) | 17.2 | (2.6) | 20.7 | (3.1) | 43.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Germany | 86.1 | (2.9) | 71.4 | (3.3) | 76.8 | (3.0) | 73.9 | (3.0) | 60.0 | (3.4) | 48.0 | (3.3) | 32.9 | (3.4) | 19.2 | (2.6) | 55.1 | (3.8) |
|  | Greece | 57.2 | (3.6) | 38.2 | (4.4) | 68.5 | (3.4) | 32.5 | (3.9) | 5.7 | (1.9) | 28.8 | (3.3) | 87.0 | (2.3) | 76.7 | (3.2) | 69.9 | (3.7) |
|  | Hungary | 96.4 | (1.4) | 90.6 | (2.4) | 79.9 | (3.5) | 96.9 | (1.3) | 57.4 | (3.8) | 80.3 | (3.3) | 71.5 | (3.5) | 17.3 | (3.2) | 69.4 | (4.0) |
|  | Iceland | 64.5 | (0.2) | 84.2 | (0.2) | 95.0 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 79.4 | (0.2) | 54.4 | (0.2) | 19.3 | (0.2) | 46.1 | (0.2) | 46.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 74.7 | (3.4) | 48.3 | (3.6) | 89.4 | (2.5) | 82.9 | (3.0) | 81.8 | (3.1) | 23.7 | (3.5) | 64.3 | (3.8) | 52.9 | (4.4) | 81.4 | (3.3) |
|  | Israel | 96.4 | (1.5) | 77.7 | (3.2) | 95.8 | (1.2) | 81.8 | (3.3) | 60.0 | (3.4) | 41.9 | (3.6) | 94.1 | (1.7) | 54.0 | (3.8) | 86.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Italy | 98.4 | (0.4) | 84.5 | (1.7) | 52.2 | (2.0) | 76.1 | (2.0) | 34.0 | (2.2) | 40.3 | (2.0) | 77.5 | (1.8) | 23.0 | (1.7) | 56.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Japan | 97.7 | (1.3) | 48.6 | (3.2) | 53.7 | (3.8) | 96.2 | (1.5) | 77.3 | (3.1) | 75.3 | (3.3) | 87.9 | (2.4) | 4.8 | (1.5) | 38.1 | (3.3) |
|  | Korea | 99.4 | (0.6) | 95.0 | (1.6) | 93.7 | (1.9) | 97.3 | (1.4) | 78.6 | (3.0) | 84.2 | (2.8) | 87.8 | (2.9) | 59.3 | (3.8) | 65.0 | (4.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 64.1 | (0.1) | 44.7 | (0.1) | 70.9 | (0.1) | 75.5 | (0.1) | 40.4 | (0.1) | 19.4 | (0.1) | 64.8 | (0.1) | 41.7 | (0.1) | 59.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 93.1 | (0.8) | 82.5 | (1.7) | 94.3 | (0.8) | 93.9 | (0.8) | 74.7 | (1.7) | 72.6 | (1.7) | 53.9 | (1.9) | 52.3 | (1.4) | 67.9 | (1.5) |
|  | Netherlands | 91.5 | (2.5) | 85.5 | (2.9) | 99.1 | (0.8) | 91.4 | (2.2) | 81.2 | (3.3) | 89.2 | (2.3) | 97.5 | (1.2) | 46.7 | (4.9) | 46.8 | (4.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 99.5 | (0.5) | 88.0 | (2.7) | 98.1 | (0.7) | 99.7 | (0.3) | 89.0 | (2.2) | 95.7 | (1.0) | 97.2 | (1.2) | 63.4 | (3.8) | 80.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Norway | 96.7 | (1.3) | 73.0 | (3.0) | 83.7 | (2.8) | 61.1 | (3.7) | 52.5 | (3.9) | 46.4 | (3.7) | 69.7 | (3.7) | 33.2 | (3.4) | 28.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Poland | 67.6 | (3.6) | 82.8 | (3.1) | 99.2 | (0.3) | 97.4 | (1.2) | 78.6 | (3.4) | 69.6 | (3.5) | 86.6 | (2.2) | 39.4 | (4.0) | 81.8 | (3.2) |
|  | Portugal | 92.8 | (2.3) | 74.0 | (4.0) | 96.5 | (1.0) | 97.6 | (1.3) | 85.5 | (2.8) | 76.9 | (3.3) | 77.8 | (3.7) | 28.9 | (3.8) | 74.6 | (3.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 86.5 | (2.9) | 79.9 | (3.4) | 93.4 | (1.8) | 94.5 | (1.5) | 37.7 | (3.4) | 52.6 | (4.0) | 87.9 | (2.9) | 53.7 | (3.8) | 61.2 | (3.8) |
|  | Slovenia | 93.7 | (0.6) | 95.3 | (0.2) | 86.4 | (0.3) | 92.2 | (0.6) | 32.4 | (0.8) | 74.9 | (0.8) | 67.2 | (0.7) | 41.0 | (0.8) | 67.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Spain | 95.8 | (1.1) | 78.7 | (2.1) | 92.0 | (1.4) | 82.2 | (1.7) | 78.5 | (2.1) | 62.9 | (2.0) | 26.1 | (1.9) | 27.2 | (2.4) | 38.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Sweden | 69.9 | (3.6) | 94.5 | (1.7) | 95.2 | (1.6) | 89.9 | (2.6) | 65.1 | (3.6) | 78.6 | (3.0) | 68.2 | (3.5) | 31.8 | (3.3) | 29.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 69.7 | (3.0) | 42.9 | (2.6) | 63.0 | (3.1) | 84.3 | (2.4) | 62.8 | (2.2) | 72.1 | (2.9) | 71.0 | (3.2) | 27.5 | (3.2) | 53.6 | (2.7) |
|  | Turkey | 89.4 | (2.3) | 93.7 | (2.1) | 96.3 | (1.8) | 98.6 | (1.3) | 79.5 | (3.9) | 90.8 | (2.3) | 86.3 | (2.2) | 59.7 | (3.6) | 74.4 | (3.2) |
|  | United Kingdom | 97.5 | (1.0) | 93.0 | (1.7) | 99.6 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 91.4 | (2.0) | 73.1 | (3.3) | 96.4 | (0.9) | 80.2 | (2.3) | 74.3 | (3.1) |
|  | United States | 98.1 | (0.9) | 95.1 | (1.8) | 98.1 | (1.1) | 92.5 | (2.3) | 86.1 | (3.2) | 58.6 | (4.8) | 98.4 | (1.0) | 73.5 | (3.8) | 88.1 | (3.0) |
|  | OECD average | 86.2 | (0.4) | 73.6 | (0.5) | 85.5 | (0.4) | 87.1 | (0.4) | 63.2 | (0.5) | 60.5 | (0.5) | 71.5 | (0.4) | 43.4 | (0.5) | 62.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Albania | 95.7 | (1.5) | 96.6 | (1.4) | 96.9 | (1.4) | 94.8 | (1.6) | 68.2 | (3.7) | 69.4 | (3.8) | 92.0 | (2.0) | 68.3 | (3.9) | 90.7 | (2.1) |
| ¢ | Argentina | 90.8 | (2.5) | 65.7 | (3.9) | 78.6 | (3.5) | 83.1 | (3.5) | 36.3 | (3.9) | 42.6 | (3.7) | 48.3 | (4.3) | 43.5 | (4.0) | 40.1 | (3.3) |
| \% | Brazil | 93.5 | (1.2) | 74.1 | (2.5) | 82.6 | (1.9) | 95.7 | (0.6) | 82.1 | (1.5) | 69.3 | (2.9) | 92.7 | (1.1) | 50.2 | (2.7) | 72.4 | (2.5) |
|  | Bulgaria | 93.0 | (1.8) | 78.6 | (3.1) | 98.3 | (1.0) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 95.2 | (1.2) | 82.0 | (3.1) | 69.3 | (3.5) | 69.6 | (3.6) | 52.8 | (3.7) |
|  | Colombia | 96.0 | (1.4) | 95.3 | (1.6) | 88.4 | (2.5) | 98.0 | (1.1) | 82.3 | (2.9) | 71.2 | (3.6) | 67.4 | (3.9) | 54.6 | (4.1) | 49.7 | (4.4) |
|  | Costa Rica | 87.4 | (2.6) | 80.3 | (2.7) | 87.2 | (2.5) | 85.2 | (3.1) | 48.4 | (3.8) | 55.9 | (3.8) | 28.0 | (3.5) | 48.0 | (3.9) | 51.4 | (4.0) |
|  | Croatia | 92.9 | (1.9) | 68.1 | (4.0) | 95.1 | (1.6) | 91.6 | (2.4) | 81.3 | (3.1) | 60.1 | (4.2) | 98.4 | (1.1) | 57.6 | (4.1) | 79.3 | (3.5) |
|  | Cyprus* | 97.5 | (0.0) | 77.6 | (0.1) | 94.7 | (0.0) | 78.3 | (0.1) | 75.5 | (0.1) | 42.7 | (0.1) | 94.5 | (0.0) | 56.4 | (0.1) | 93.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 98.1 | (1.1) | 90.7 | (2.3) | 100.0 | , | 99.9 | (0.1) | 91.3 | (2.4) | 81.1 | (3.2) | 91.0 | (2.3) | 45.1 | (4.1) | 85.6 | (3.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 98.7 | (0.8) | 91.5 | (1.8) | 100.0 | c | 91.5 | (2.4) | 84.8 | (3.2) | 84.7 | (2.8) | 100.0 | c | 73.5 | (3.3) | 81.6 | (2.9) |
|  | Jordan | 90.8 | (2.2) | 91.6 | (1.9) | 93.1 | (1.9) | 90.4 | (2.3) | 71.0 | (3.2) | 72.4 | (3.1) | 68.4 | (3.8) | 57.0 | (3.8) | 75.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 97.1 | (1.5) | 98.6 | (1.0) | 100.0 | c | 99.0 | (0.8) | 94.9 | (1.7) | 81.5 | (3.3) | 97.4 | (1.1) | 86.8 | (2.6) | 92.4 | (1.9) |
|  | Latvia | 96.4 | (1.4) | 87.7 | (2.4) | 99.8 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 84.2 | (2.6) | 76.5 | (3.2) | 71.9 | (3.3) | 23.5 | (3.5) | 51.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 81.1 | (0.9) | 59.2 | (0.7) | 37.1 | (1.0) | 93.6 | (0.4) | 83.2 | (0.7) | 93.8 | (0.6) | 81.8 | (0.5) | 67.5 | (0.9) | 56.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Lithuania | 72.7 | (3.4) | 78.6 | (2.9) | 98.0 | (1.0) | 95.0 | (1.3) | 56.5 | (3.8) | 75.2 | (2.9) | 53.5 | (3.5) | 40.2 | (3.0) | 30.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 90.4 | (0.0) | 93.5 | (0.0) | 98.6 | (0.0) | 87.7 | (0.0) | 63.7 | (0.1) | 70.3 | (0.1) | 91.3 | (0.0) | 44.0 | (0.1) | 57.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 97.4 | (1.3) | 100.0 | c | 98.8 | (0.7) | 98.6 | (0.7) | 82.7 | (2.6) | 70.1 | (3.4) | 88.7 | (2.5) | 82.1 | (2.8) | 93.2 | (2.2) |
|  | Montenegro | 94.9 | (0.1) | 81.4 | (0.1) | 97.3 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 93.1 | (0.1) | 59.2 | (0.2) | 97.8 | (0.0) | 73.9 | (0.1) | 89.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 89.1 | (2.2) | 66.6 | (3.6) | 67.3 | (3.1) | 86.7 | (2.1) | 41.6 | (3.7) | 66.9 | (3.3) | 97.5 | (1.5) | 41.7 | (3.5) | 44.4 | (3.5) |
|  | Qatar | 99.7 | (0.0) | 97.9 | (0.0) | 99.5 | (0.0) | 99.3 | (0.0) | 86.8 | (0.1) | 89.5 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 90.0 | (0.0) | 98.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Romania | 87.5 | (2.6) | 86.6 | (2.5) | 88.6 | (2.4) | 87.6 | (2.0) | 83.6 | (2.8) | 82.9 | (2.7) | 84.6 | (2.9) | 66.2 | (3.5) | 73.7 | (3.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 93.1 | (2.1) | 89.4 | (1.8) | 98.2 | (0.8) | 98.4 | (0.7) | 96.0 | (1.1) | 83.0 | (2.8) | 96.0 | (1.4) | 54.2 | (3.5) | 86.1 | (2.6) |
|  | Serbia | 81.9 | (3.4) | 54.6 | (4.0) | 96.5 | (1.7) | 95.9 | (1.5) | 52.6 | (4.4) | 48.0 | (4.3) | 97.7 | (1.1) | 58.1 | (4.6) | 41.3 | (4.4) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 100.0 | c | 86.2 | (2.7) | 97.5 | (1.2) | 100.0 | c | 88.4 | (2.7) | 91.4 | (2.1) | 98.5 | (0.7) | 93.2 | (1.9) | 94.1 | (2.1) |
|  | Singapore | 98.9 | (0.0) | 97.7 | (0.8) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 100.0 | c | 93.4 | (0.5) | 87.4 | (0.1) | 99.7 | (0.0) | 63.4 | (0.3) | 92.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 94.1 | (1.4) | 87.9 | (2.8) | 92.3 | (1.8) | 83.7 | (3.2) | 75.3 | (3.5) | 62.0 | (3.4) | 73.2 | (3.5) | 32.3 | (3.6) | 57.3 | (4.3) |
|  | Thailand | 97.6 | (1.1) | 93.9 | (1.9) | 98.4 | (1.0) | 100.0 | c | 99.3 | (0.3) | 80.3 | (3.1) | 98.2 | (1.1) | 88.8 | (2.4) | 86.1 | (2.6) |
|  | Tunisia | 50.2 | (4.0) | 33.5 | (4.0) | 71.4 | (3.6) | 91.5 | (2.0) | 48.7 | (4.5) | 29.3 | (3.8) | 80.3 | (3.3) | 21.4 | (3.1) | 60.6 | (3.7) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 95.4 | (1.2) | 95.7 | (1.0) | 99.0 | (0.4) | 97.6 | (0.7) | 94.0 | (1.1) | 77.5 | (2.0) | 92.0 | (0.9) | 73.1 | (2.0) | 82.0 | (2.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 75.2 | (3.4) | 59.1 | (3.5) | 96.0 | (1.5) | 84.9 | (2.3) | 44.8 | (3.8) | 52.6 | (3.9) | 74.5 | (2.9) | 27.4 | (3.3) | 29.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Viet Nam | 98.1 | (1.1) | 92.2 | (2.1) | 97.8 | (1.3) | 96.1 | (1.7) | 49.4 | (3.9) | 84.9 | (3.1) | 98.5 | (1.0) | 45.2 | (4.3) | 93.2 | (2.1) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[Part 1/1]
Internal or external evaluations and feedback from students
Table IV.4.33 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that there are... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ...neither internal nor external evaluations... |  |  |  | ...internal or external evaluations... |  |  |  |
|  | ..and no written feedback from students is sought (regarding lessons, teachers or resources) |  | ...but written feedback from students is sought (regarding lessons, teachers or resources) |  | ...but no written feedback from students is sought (regarding lessons, teachers or resources) |  | ...and written feedback from students is sought (regarding lessons, teachers or resources) |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 2.4 | (0.6) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 28.5 | (1.7) | 67.5 | (1.8) |
| $\bigcirc$ Austria | 6.0 | (1.9) | 5.9 | (1.6) | 12.9 | (2.7) | 75.1 | (3.3) |
| Belgium | 7.9 | (1.6) | 1.4 | (0.6) | 56.3 | (3.0) | 34.4 | (2.7) |
| Canada | 11.8 | (1.4) | 1.8 | (0.5) | 46.3 | (2.3) | 40.1 | (2.4) |
| Chile | 4.4 | (1.6) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 46.4 | (4.3) | 47.8 | (4.5) |
| Czech Republic | 0.6 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 36.9 | (4.1) | 62.0 | (4.0) |
| Denmark | 5.0 | (1.5) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 58.4 | (3.3) | 36.1 | (3.3) |
| Estonia | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 16.0 | (2.0) | 83.4 | (2.0) |
| Finland | 0.8 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 24.6 | (2.9) | 73.5 | (3.0) |
| France | 20.5 | (2.8) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 66.1 | (2.9) | 12.0 | (2.5) |
| Germany | 12.6 | (2.2) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 39.3 | (3.2) | 46.6 | (3.3) |
| Greece | 51.0 | (3.8) | 14.5 | (2.9) | 20.0 | (2.9) | 14.4 | (2.9) |
| Hungary | 0.2 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 19.6 | (3.3) | 78.5 | (3.5) |
| Iceland | 0.3 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c | 45.3 | (0.2) | 54.4 | (0.2) |
| Ireland | 2.7 | (1.4) | 0.0 | c | 74.2 | (3.8) | 23.2 | (3.5) |
| Israel | 9.0 | (2.3) | 1.8 | (1.0) | 49.1 | (4.2) | 40.2 | (3.7) |
| Italy | 16.4 | (1.8) | 3.2 | (0.6) | 43.3 | (2.3) | 37.2 | (2.0) |
| Japan | 3.0 | (1.4) | 0.0 | c | 21.8 | (3.0) | 75.3 | (3.3) |
| Korea | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | (0.9) | 15.8 | (2.8) | 82.9 | (2.9) |
| Luxembourg | 17.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.0) | 63.3 | (0.1) | 19.1 | (0.1) |
| Mexico | 1.1 | (0.4) | 1.0 | (0.3) | 26.2 | (1.6) | 71.7 | (1.7) |
| Netherlands | 2.2 | (1.3) | 2.3 | (1.2) | 8.1 | (1.9) | 87.5 | (2.4) |
| New Zealand | 0.3 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 3.9 | (0.9) | 95.7 | (1.0) |
| Norway | 11.0 | (2.4) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 42.6 | (3.6) | 37.5 | (3.6) |
| Poland | 0.6 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 29.8 | (3.5) | 69.6 | (3.5) |
| Portugal | 0.2 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.8) | 22.9 | (3.3) | 76.1 | (3.2) |
| Slovak Republic | 0.8 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.6) | 46.6 | (4.0) | 51.5 | (4.0) |
| Slovenia | 3.7 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 21.4 | (0.8) | 72.7 | (0.8) |
| Spain | 6.0 | (1.6) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 31.0 | (2.3) | 61.6 | (2.0) |
| Sweden | 2.8 | (1.2) | 3.4 | (1.4) | 18.6 | (3.0) | 75.2 | (3.2) |
| Switzerland | 11.8 | (2.3) | 1.4 | (0.4) | 16.1 | (2.2) | 70.7 | (2.8) |
| Turkey | 0.0 | c | 1.4 | (1.3) | 9.2 | (2.3) | 89.4 | (2.6) |
| United Kingdom | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 26.9 | (3.3) | 73.1 | (3.3) |
| United States | 2.0 | (1.2) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 39.4 | (4.7) | 57.7 | (4.7) |
| OECD average | 6.3 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 33.1 | (0.5) | 58.6 | (0.5) |
| in Albania | 2.6 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 28.2 | (3.8) | 69.2 | (3.9) |
| Argentina | 7.3 | (2.5) | 4.3 | (1.7) | 50.0 | (3.8) | 38.4 | (3.4) |
| ¿ Brazil | 1.6 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 29.1 | (2.9) | 68.7 | (2.9) |
| Bulgaria | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 18.0 | (3.1) | 82.0 | (3.1) |
| Colombia | 1.9 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 26.9 | (3.6) | 71.1 | (3.6) |
| Costa Rica | 8.6 | (1.9) | 1.6 | (1.1) | 34.9 | (3.7) | 54.8 | (3.9) |
| Croatia | 0.3 | (0.3) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 39.6 | (4.2) | 58.2 | (4.2) |
| Cyprus* | 3.6 | (0.0) | 3.8 | (0.0) | 53.7 | (0.1) | 38.9 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 18.9 | (3.2) | 81.1 | (3.2) |
| Indonesia | 1.0 | (0.8) | 1.2 | (0.9) | 14.3 | (2.7) | 83.5 | (2.8) |
| Jordan | 2.8 | (1.2) | 1.3 | (0.9) | 24.8 | (3.0) | 71.1 | (3.1) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 18.5 | (3.3) | 81.5 | (3.3) |
| Latvia | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 23.5 | (3.2) | 76.5 | (3.2) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 6.2 | (0.6) | 93.8 | (0.6) |
| Lithuania | 0.8 | (0.5) | 1.7 | (1.0) | 23.9 | (2.9) | 73.5 | (2.9) |
| Macao-China | 0.0 | c | 2.7 | (0.0) | 29.7 | (0.1) | 67.7 | (0.1) |
| Malaysia | 0.7 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.5) | 29.3 | (3.4) | 69.3 | (3.5) |
| Montenegro | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 40.8 | (0.2) | 59.2 | (0.2) |
| Peru | 6.6 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (1.0) | 26.9 | (3.0) | 63.9 | (3.4) |
| Qatar | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.0) | 10.5 | (0.1) | 89.3 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 2.6 | (0.8) | 2.8 | (1.3) | 14.5 | (2.7) | 80.1 | (2.9) |
| Russian Federation | 0.3 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 16.7 | (2.8) | 83.0 | (2.8) |
| Serbia | 3.1 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 48.5 | (4.4) | 48.4 | (4.4) |
| Shanghai-China | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 8.6 | (2.1) | 91.4 | (2.1) |
| Singapore | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 12.6 | (0.1) | 87.4 | (0.1) |
| Chinese Taipei | 8.4 | (2.5) | 1.6 | (1.0) | 29.6 | (2.9) | 60.4 | (3.4) |
| Thailand | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 19.7 | (3.1) | 80.3 | (3.1) |
| Tunisia | 5.6 | (1.8) | 1.5 | (1.0) | 64.9 | (3.9) | 28.0 | (3.7) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 22.2 | (2.0) | 77.5 | (2.0) |
| Uruguay | 4.5 | (1.5) | 6.3 | (1.5) | 43.2 | (4.2) | 46.0 | (4.0) |
| Viet Nam | 1.4 | (1.0) | 2.5 | (1.4) | 13.6 | (3.0) | 82.4 | (3.4) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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Table IV.4.34 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers at their schools: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tests or | of student | Teacher peer review of lesson plans, assessment instruments and lessons |  | Principal or senior staff observations of lessons |  | Observation of classes by inspectors or other persons external to the school |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 78.8 | (1.5) | 77.4 | (1.5) | 70.0 | (1.8) | 10.9 | (1.3) |
| U | Austria | 91.0 | (2.1) | 78.6 | (3.4) | 73.9 | (3.5) | 29.2 | (3.1) |
|  | Belgium | 65.6 | (3.2) | 76.3 | (2.4) | 65.0 | (3.2) | 48.0 | (2.8) |
|  | Canada | 72.9 | (2.3) | 60.0 | (2.1) | 81.9 | (1.6) | 20.6 | (2.2) |
|  | Chile | 76.9 | (3.2) | 80.3 | (3.2) | 91.0 | (2.1) | 25.2 | (3.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | 92.0 | (2.3) | 66.6 | (3.7) | 98.0 | (0.8) | 32.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Denmark | 75.1 | (2.8) | 40.9 | (3.6) | 64.3 | (3.8) | 16.8 | (2.5) |
|  | Estonia | 71.3 | (2.8) | 48.8 | (2.7) | 89.6 | (1.5) | 7.6 | (1.7) |
|  | Finland | 39.6 | (3.2) | 19.1 | (2.9) | 31.3 | (2.5) | 2.2 | (0.8) |
|  | France | 60.5 | (3.4) | 42.5 | (3.5) | 12.3 | (2.3) | 72.9 | (3.3) |
|  | Germany | 72.1 | (3.3) | 44.6 | (3.0) | 66.9 | (3.3) | 22.1 | (3.0) |
|  | Greece | 59.7 | (3.7) | 26.0 | (3.5) | 8.3 | (2.3) | 20.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Hungary | 74.3 | (3.6) | 74.5 | (3.1) | 96.7 | (1.3) | 13.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Iceland | 84.2 | (0.2) | 12.1 | (0.2) | 46.4 | (0.2) | 25.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 65.3 | (3.9) | 33.7 | (3.6) | 12.7 | (2.4) | 48.5 | (3.9) |
|  | Israel | 96.0 | (1.4) | 51.3 | (3.8) | 74.8 | (3.6) | 34.0 | (3.4) |
|  | Italy | 74.1 | (1.8) | 87.4 | (1.7) | 17.2 | (1.4) | 0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Japan | 69.4 | (3.3) | 54.2 | (3.4) | 81.0 | (2.6) | 26.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Korea | 84.1 | (3.1) | 98.7 | (0.9) | 96.0 | (1.7) | 68.5 | (3.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 80.6 | (0.1) | 63.3 | (0.1) | 47.9 | (0.1) | 6.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 92.5 | (0.9) | 76.4 | (1.7) | 76.6 | (1.3) | 41.1 | (1.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 83.2 | (3.6) | 54.0 | (4.6) | 86.6 | (3.1) | 41.9 | (4.5) |
|  | New Zealand | 84.1 | (3.5) | 91.7 | (2.3) | 96.6 | (1.1) | 32.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Norway | 72.4 | (2.7) | 53.9 | (4.1) | 47.7 | (3.7) | 10.9 | (2.2) |
|  | Poland | 100.0 | c | 64.4 | (4.0) | 94.4 | (1.8) | 16.2 | (3.1) |
|  | Portugal | 98.2 | (1.1) | 71.3 | (4.6) | 60.2 | (3.4) | 4.2 | (2.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 74.6 | (3.2) | 84.2 | (3.0) | 98.2 | (0.8) | 27.0 | (3.4) |
|  | Slovenia | 72.1 | (0.7) | 62.4 | (0.8) | 94.1 | (0.5) | 4.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Spain | 78.0 | (2.5) | 21.9 | (2.2) | 9.6 | (1.4) | 15.5 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | 67.5 | (3.5) | 58.7 | (3.7) | 79.7 | (3.2) | 26.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 60.6 | (3.0) | 62.9 | (3.3) | 83.0 | (2.2) | 28.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Turkey | 91.6 | (2.7) | 51.8 | (3.8) | 93.9 | (1.9) | 22.1 | (3.6) |
|  | United Kingdom | 94.7 | (1.2) | 92.9 | (1.5) | 96.6 | (1.0) | 68.0 | (2.9) |
|  | United States | 89.4 | (2.7) | 65.9 | (3.7) | 99.7 | (0.3) | 42.0 | (4.5) |
|  | OECD average | 77.7 | (0.5) | 60.3 | (0.5) | 68.9 | (0.4) | 26.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Albania | 98.3 | (0.9) | 91.9 | (2.2) | 99.2 | (0.7) | 62.2 | (3.6) |
| - | Argentina | 82.0 | (3.0) | 73.5 | (3.9) | 85.0 | (2.8) | 21.5 | (3.7) |
| ๕ | Brazil | 88.3 | (1.4) | 74.8 | (2.2) | 49.8 | (2.1) | 22.8 | (2.4) |
|  | Bulgaria | 90.8 | (2.1) | 29.4 | (3.7) | 97.1 | (1.3) | 48.8 | (3.8) |
|  | Colombia | 83.7 | (2.9) | 60.4 | (4.0) | 43.0 | (3.8) | 10.7 | (2.5) |
|  | Costa Rica | 83.3 | (2.8) | 80.9 | (2.6) | 86.5 | (2.2) | 45.1 | (3.5) |
|  | Croatia | 72.4 | (3.5) | 62.0 | (3.7) | 93.0 | (2.0) | 33.7 | (3.3) |
|  | Cyprus* | 89.5 | (0.1) | 63.5 | (0.1) | 92.0 | (0.1) | 86.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 94.9 | (1.8) | 85.0 | (3.1) | 96.7 | (1.5) | 39.0 | (4.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 91.3 | (2.4) | 91.3 | (1.6) | 95.4 | (1.5) | 77.1 | (3.6) |
|  | Jordan | 93.9 | (1.9) | 93.0 | (1.8) | 97.9 | (1.0) | 96.6 | (1.6) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 98.9 | (0.7) | 98.9 | (0.7) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 81.9 | (3.0) |
|  | Latvia | 83.2 | (2.8) | 89.3 | (2.3) | 100.0 | c | 41.0 | (3.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 82.4 | (0.7) | 69.6 | (1.0) | 49.4 | (0.8) | 86.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Lithuania | 95.6 | (1.3) | 74.7 | (3.1) | 98.2 | (1.0) | 37.7 | (3.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 89.9 | (0.0) | 88.0 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.0) | 47.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Malaysia | 98.7 | (0.9) | 91.0 | (2.4) | 98.9 | (0.8) | 69.5 | (3.8) |
|  | Montenegro | 80.9 | (0.1) | 72.3 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.0) | 55.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Peru | 71.4 | (3.2) | 79.7 | (2.6) | 84.4 | (2.5) | 53.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Qatar | 96.6 | (0.0) | 98.0 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.0) | 82.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 67.6 | (3.1) | 69.4 | (3.1) | 73.3 | (3.3) | 57.7 | (3.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 98.9 | (0.5) | 95.9 | (1.1) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 43.8 | (4.2) |
|  | Serbia | 50.1 | (4.2) | 58.8 | (4.5) | 94.5 | (2.3) | 34.0 | (4.3) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 92.4 | (2.0) | 91.3 | (2.2) | 97.4 | (1.2) | 89.8 | (1.8) |
|  | Singapore | 96.2 | (0.6) | 85.5 | (0.1) | 99.8 | (0.0) | 23.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 81.9 | (3.2) | 60.8 | (3.8) | 61.0 | (3.8) | 7.7 | (1.9) |
|  | Thailand | 97.9 | (1.1) | 92.5 | (2.1) | 95.1 | (1.6) | 44.7 | (4.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 75.0 | (3.8) | 39.6 | (3.9) | 50.1 | (4.1) | 86.9 | (2.7) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 96.5 | (1.0) | 84.8 | (2.2) | 99.7 | (0.2) | 84.2 | (2.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 57.8 | (3.9) | 63.3 | (3.6) | 88.4 | (2.2) | 66.2 | (3.2) |
|  | Viet Nam | 97.7 | (1.4) | 83.0 | (2.7) | 96.7 | (1.6) | 85.2 | (3.1) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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| Albania | 61.3 | (3.7) | 33.1 | (3.7) | 5.7 | (1.6) | 77.8 | (3.2) | 20.7 | (3.0) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 24.6 | (3.5) | 69.5 | (3.4) | 5.9 | (1.6) | 33.7 | (3.9) | 61.6 | (3.8) | 4.7 | (1.6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| § Argentina | 90.5 | (2.0) | 9.5 | (2.0) | 0.0 | c | 94.2 | (1.6) | 5.7 | (1.6) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 38.0 | (4.0) | 53.1 | (4.3) | 8.9 | (2.2) | 32.9 | (3.8) | 54.7 | (4.0) | 12.4 | (2,7) |
| ๕ Brazil | 64.1 | (2.5) | 32.6 | (2.6) | 3.4 | (1.1) | 57.0 | (2.6) | 37.5 | (2.5) | 5.4 | (1.3) | 34.5 | (2.4) | 57.2 | (3.0) | 8.3 | (1.6) | 42.6 | (2.3) | 49.7 | (2.8) | 7.7 | (1.5) |
| Bulgaria | 0.7 | (3.4) | 29.0 | (3.4) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 14.7 | (2.3) | 79.4 | (2.7) | 5.9 | (1.6) | 10.1 | (2.2) | 83.4 | (2.6) | 6.6 | (1.8) | 15.1 | (2.7) | 8.6 | 3.1) | 6.3 | (2.) |
| Colombia | 60.9 | (3.9) | 35.7 | (3.9) | 3.4 | (1.0) | 79.3 | (2.9) | 18.0 | (2.8) | 2.7 | (1.0) | 26.5 | (3.5) | 58.4 | (3.8) | 15.1 | (2.6) | 26.2 | (3.5) | 57.0 | (3.9) | 16.7 | (2.6) |
| Costa Rica | 7.2 | (3.5) | 29.0 | (3.3) | 3.8 | (1.5) | 83.0 | (2.6) | 14.6 | (2.5) | 2.4 | (1.2) | 28.2 | (3.7) | 59.5 | (4.) | 12.3 | (2.3 | 26.8 | (3.1) | 62 | 3.6) | 1.0 | (2.2) |
| Croatia | 84.7 | (2.9) | 12.1 | (2.5) | 3.2 | (1.5) | 73.5 | (3.7) | 20.9 | (3.3) | 5.6 | (1.8) | 12.4 | (2.6) | 74.7 | (3.5) | 12.9 | (2.6) | 9.5 | (2.4) | 76 | (3.3) | 13.8 | (2.7) |
| Cyprus* | 8.5 | (0.1) | 20.4 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.0) | 83.5 | (0.1) | 16.5 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 23.3 | (0.1) | 73.1 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.1) | 14.8 | (0.1) | 75.1 | (0.1) | 10.1 | (0.1) |
| Hong Kong-China | 69.7 | (4.2) | 28.3 | (4.1) | 2.1 | (1.2) | 83.9 | (2.9) | 15.2 | (2.7) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 38.7 | (4.3) | 59.1 | (4.4) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 2.0 | (1.1) | 84.2 | (3.1) | 13.8 | (3.0) |
| Indonesia | 5.0 | (2.8) | 78.7 | (3.7) | 6.3 | (1.9) | 19.8 | (3.1) | 79.5 | (3.1) | 0.6 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (1.3) | 76.1 | (3.2) | 20.8 | (3.1) | 2.9 | (1.1) | 78.7 | (3.3) | 18.4 | 3.2) |
| Jordan | 41.0 | (3.2) | 39.4 | (3.7) | 19.6 | (3.1) | 39.9 | (3.3) | 33.8 | (3.5) | 26.3 | (3.1) | 18.6 | (2.8) | 66.1 | (3.4) | 15.3 | (3.1) | 20.7 | (2.8) | 59.1 | 3.5) | 20.2 | (2.8) |
| Kazakhstan | 37.7 | (4.1) | 56.5 | (4.2) | 5.8 | (1.7) | 33.5 | (3.3) | 55.5 | (3.9) | 11.1 | (2.4) | 4.9 | (1.3) | 69.0 | (3.8) | 26.1 | (3.7) | 16.6 | (2.7) | 68.9 | (3.6) | 14.5 | (3.0) |
| Latvia | 56.3 | (3.2) | 37.4 | (3.0) | 6.3 | (1.6) | 64.9 | (3.6) | 28.8 | (3.5) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 13.2 | (2.5) | 77.7 | (3.2) | 9.1 | (2.3) | 35.6 | (3.1) | 60 | (3.2) | 4.3 | 1.1) |
| Liechtenstei | 93.8 | (0.6) | 6.2 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 93.8 | (0.6) | 6.2 | (0.6) | 0.0 |  | 12.1 | (1.1) | 87.9 | (1.1) | 0.0 |  | 74.3 | (0.9) | 25.7 | (0.9) | 0.0 |  |
| Lithuania | 55.0 | (3.5) | 41.4 | (3.3) | 3.6 | (1.3) | 52.5 | (3.4) | 40.9 | (3.4) | 6.7 | (2.0) | 12.2 | (2.0 | 70.9 | (3.3) | 16.9 | (2.8) | 36. | (3.2) | 57.0 | (3.5) | 6.1 | .7) |
| Macao-China | 38.4 | (0.0) | 60.5 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 31.0 | (0.0) | 68.8 | (0.0) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 20.1 | (0.1) | 78.8 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 11.3 | (0.0) | 79.8 | (0.0) | 8.9 | (0.0) |
| Malaysia | 25.1 | (3.8) | 52.5 | (4.1) | 22.4 | (3.7) | 14.9 | . 0 | 63.3 | (3.8) | 21.8 | (3.5) | 6.5 | (2.0) | 67.5 | (3.9) | 26.0 | (3.7) | 7.1 | (2.1) | 64 | 4.1) | 28.5 | (3.9) |
| Montenegro | 82.3 | (0.1) | 15.8 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.0) | 77.8 | (0.1) | 16.7 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (0.1) | 15.3 | (0.1) | 65.1 | (0.1) | 19.6 | (0.1) | 30.2 | (0.1) | 59.2 | (0.1) | 10.7 | (0.1) |
| Peru | 1.4 | (3.3) | 44.0 | (3) | 4.6 | (1.7) | 58.8 | (3.6) | 39.2 | (3.6) | 2.1 | (1.2) | 26.5 | (3.0) | 67.2 | (3.2) | 6.3 | (1.8) | 30.7 | (3.2) | 61.8 | 3.5) | 7.5 | (2.1) |
| Qatar | 45.9 | (0.1) | 48.4 | (0.1) | 5.8 | (0.1) | 33.7 | (0.1) | 56.2 | (0.1) | 10.1 | (0.1) | 4.6 | (0.0) | 51.5 | (0.1) | 43.9 | (0.1) | 10.7 | (0.1) | 68.1 | (0.1) | 21.2 | (0.1) |
| Romania | 70.2 | (3.1) | 29.2 | (3.2) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 66.9 | (3.6) | 32.4 | (3.6) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 34.0 | (3.4) | 57.0 | (3.9) | 9.0 | (2.3) | 28.4 | (3.4) | 67.5 | 3.5) | . 1 | (1.6) |
| Russian Federation | 5.7 | (1.7) | 79.4 | (3.0) | 14.9 | (2.7) | 9.8 | (1.8) | 70.6 | (2.6) | 19.6 | (2.3) | 8.0 | (2.2) | 67.3 | (3.7) | 24.7 | (3.1) | 7.5 | (1.6) | 77.0 | (2.8) | 15.5 | (2.6) |
| Serbia | 87.3 | (3.0) | 11.7 | (2.9) | 0.9 | (0.8) | 76.1 | (4.0) | 23.1 | (4.0) | 0.8 | (0.7) | 34.7 | (4.2) | 61.3 | (4.2) | 4.0 | (1.8) | 54.6 | (4.5) | 42.6 | 4.4) | . 8 | (1.6) |
| Shanghai-China | 58.9 | (4.3) | 35.4 | (4.1) | 5.6 | (1.6) | 7.7 | (2.0) | 85.2 | (2.6) | 7.1 | (1.6) | 6.4 | (2.0) | 72.5 | (3.8) | 21.1 | (3.4) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 78 | (3.3) | 18.1 | (3.0) |
| Singapore | 39.2 | (0.5) | 56.4 | (0.5) | 4.4 | (0.1) | 6.3 | (0.8) | 65.2 | (0.5) | 28.5 | (0.3) | 6.7 | (0.6 | 77.9 | 0.6) | 15.4 | (0.2) | 3.7 | (0.6) | 79. | 0.6) | 17.1 | (0.2) |
| Chinese Taipei | 72.5 | (3.4) | 19.4 | (3.2) | 8.1 | (2.5) | 60.9 | (3.8) | 32.3 | (3.7) | 6.8 | (2.3) | 16.9 | (3.1) | 71.8 | (3.8) | 11.3 | (2.6) | 48.3 | (3.7) | 43.5 | (3.7) | 8.2 | (2.3) |
| Thailand | 11.9 | (2.2) | 77.2 | (3.0) | 11.0 | (2.4) | 26.2 | (3.0) | 65.8 | (3.2) | 8.0 | (2.2) | 14.3 | (3.0) | 71.0 | (3.4) | 14.6 | (2.4) | 14.0 | (2.9) | 74.8 | (3.1) | 11.3 | (2.3) |
| Tunisia | 28.4 | (3.9) | 54.0 | (4.8) | 17.6 | (3.3) | 33.8 | (4.2) | 49.5 | (4.7) | 16.7 | (3.4) | 9.7 | (2.7) | 72.6 | (4.1) | 17.7 | (3.2) | 12.9 | (2.9) | 62.4 | (3.9) | 24.7 | (3.4) |
| United Arab Emirates | 41.6 | (2.1) | 43.0 | (2.0) | 15.4 | (1.9) | 50.4 | (2.5) | 38.3 | (2.4) | 11.3 | (1.7) | 7.2 | (1.9) | 61.0 | (2.1) | 31.8 | (2.1) | 11.3 | (2.1) | 67.3 | (2.3) | 21.4 | (2.1) |
| Uruguay | 72.5 | (3.7) | 24.7 | (3.4) | 2.8 | (1.5) | 75.5 | (3.1) | 20.1 | (2.9) | 4.4 | (1.8) | 32.4 | (3.6) | 58.1 | (3.7) | 9.5 | (2.0) | 44.2 | (3.6) | 50.0 | (3.8) | 5.9 | (1.9) |
| Viet Nam | 2.1 | (3.5) | 64.6 | (3.8) | 7.3 | (1.9) | 8.3 | (2.0) | 80.8 | (2.9) | 10.9 | (2.3) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 87.2 | (2) | 11.0 | (2.4) | 4.8 | (1.3) | 87 | (2.2) | 7.7 | (2.0) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex

StatLink (anाsth http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
[Part 2/2]
Consequences of teacher appraisals
Table IV.4.35 Results based on school principals' reports


* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 齐isk http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in assessment practices
Table IV.4.36 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in national modal grade for 15 -year-olds are used for the following purposes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of assessment practices (sum of "yes" for these eight practices) |  |
|  |  | To inform parents about their child's progress |  | To make decisions about students' retention or promotion |  | To group students for instructional purposes |  | To compare the school to district or nationalperformance |  | To monitor the school's progress from year to year |  | To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness |  | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved |  | To compare the school with other schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 100.0 | c | 61.5 | (2.9) | 77.8 | (2.6) | 54.9 | (2.4) | 76.5 | (2.7) | 34.0 | (2.9) | 81.5 | (2.5) | 38.7 | (2.7) | 5.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Austria | 92.2 | (2.2) | 93.2 | (2.3) | 31.8 | (2.3) | 12.4 | (2.8) | 59.2 | (3.9) | 35.6 | (3.5) | 65.6 | (3.7) | 38.0 | (3.9) | 4.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Belgium | 99.6 | (0.4) | 99.1 | (0.6) | 19.9 | (2.4) | 9.6 | (2.2) | 37.6 | (2.8) | 19.4 | (2.4) | 66.1 | (3.0) | 6.9 | (1.7) | 3.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Canada | 99.4 | (0.3) | 95.5 | (1.0) | 72.0 | (2.1) | 70.1 | (2.2) | 79.5 | (1.8) | 31.4 | (2.4) | 84.1 | (1.8) | 53.0 | (2.4) | 5.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 98.3 | (0.9) | 91.8 | (1.9) | 35.2 | (3.3) | 50.0 | (3.3) | 85.6 | (2.4) | 61.7 | (3.4) | 88.7 | (2.1) | 55.3 | (3.7) | 5.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Denmark | 67.6 | (3.5) | 3.8 | (0.9) | 14.1 | (2.6) | 5.9 | (1.7) | 8.4 | (2.0) | 3.7 | (1.4) | 46.7 | (3.9) | 2.9 | (1.3) | 1.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Finland | 100.0 | (0.0) | 95.2 | (0.9) | 17.1 | (3.0) | 56.3 | (4.0) | 65.0 | (4.1) | 32.1 | (3.5) | 65.6 | (3.6) | 34.9 | (3.5) | 4.6 | (0.1) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | 96.1 | (1.4) | 96.3 | (1.2) | 35.8 | (3.0) | 21.2 | (3.2) | 44.0 | (3.2) | 11.8 | (2.3) | 44.8 | (3.9) | 17.1 | (2.7) | 3.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Greece | 96.6 | (2.0) | 99.4 | (0.5) | 11.1 | (2.1) | 12.2 | (2.8) | 35.6 | (5.7) | 15.2 | (4.4) | 40.5 | (5.3) | 15.8 | (3.0) | 3.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Hungary | 99.1 | (0.9) | 94.7 | (1.9) | 34.8 | (3.5) | 86.4 | (2.6) | 95.8 | (1.4) | 77.0 | (3.5) | 93.7 | (2.1) | 77.5 | (3.2) | 6.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Iceland | 99.7 | (0.0) | 14.8 | (0.1) | 56.1 | (0.2) | 84.1 | (0.1) | 88.1 | (0.1) | 30.9 | (0.2) | 96.6 | (0.0) | 65.6 | (0.2) | 5.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 99.3 | (0.7) | 43.7 | (4.2) | 78.1 | (3.3) | 17.2 | (3.2) | 49.5 | (4.0) | 16.9 | (3.2) | 42.2 | (4.3) | 8.8 | (2.6) | 3.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Italy | 96.0 | (1.3) | 83.7 | (2.8) | 51.5 | (3.9) | 32.8 | (3.4) | 69.3 | (3.0) | 23.3 | (3.2) | 83.8 | (2.9) | 29.1 | (3.2) | 4.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 98.3 | (1.0) | 89.5 | (2.6) | 44.7 | (4.5) | 17.8 | (3.4) | 47.7 | (4.4) | 81.5 | (3.3) | 78.9 | (3.4) | 11.8 | (2.8) | 4.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Korea | 95.5 | (1.8) | 24.8 | (3.8) | 62.6 | (4.0) | 62.0 | (3.7) | 58.6 | (4.0) | 54.5 | (4.3) | 90.2 | (2.7) | 54.9 | (3.9) | 5.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 29.7 | (0.1) | 21.8 | (0.0) | 26.1 | (0.1) | 21.0 | (0.0) | 62.9 | (0.1) | 10.3 | (0.0) | 3.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 96.7 | (0.9) | 92.9 | (1.8) | 59.4 | (3.2) | 55.5 | (3.1) | 91.2 | (1.6) | 77.3 | (3.1) | 89.2 | (2.2) | 50.5 | (3.5) | 6.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 99.5 | (0.5) | 96.8 | (1.6) | 88.7 | (2.7) | 63.5 | (4.1) | 63.3 | (4.2) | 42.2 | (4.4) | 71.8 | (3.9) | 47.0 | (4.4) | 5.7 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 98.4 | (1.0) | 77.9 | (2.8) | 73.7 | (3.0) | 86.7 | (2.3) | 95.6 | (1.6) | 53.0 | (3.4) | 95.8 | (1.2) | 73.5 | (3.2) | 6.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Norway | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 37.8 | (4.0) | 63.8 | (3.6) | 67.7 | (3.3) | 19.5 | (3.0) | 70.1 | (3.5) | 47.1 | (3.8) | 4.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Poland | 98.0 | (1.1) | 84.2 | (2.8) | 33.0 | (4.1) | 71.1 | (3.7) | 96.6 | (1.5) | 73.2 | (3.2) | 87.8 | (2.8) | 62.3 | (3.6) | 6.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 98.8 | (0.7) | 96.6 | (1.6) | 26.1 | (3.8) | 32.9 | (4.2) | 78.5 | (3.1) | 34.7 | (4.4) | 84.3 | (3.2) | 22.3 | (3.4) | 4.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 98.7 | (0.7) | 96.7 | (1.0) | 54.9 | (3.8) | 45.9 | (3.7) | 95.0 | (1.5) | 75.0 | (2.7) | 89.0 | (2.2) | 47.7 | (3.1) | 6.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Spain | 99.7 | (0.3) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 47.6 | (3.5) | 18.2 | (2.1) | 68.6 | (3.2) | 35.9 | (3.5) | 88.5 | (2.3) | 17.2 | (2.1) | 4.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Sweden | 96.4 | (1.5) | 38.9 | (4.1) | 45.2 | (4.0) | 73.0 | (3.1) | 85.4 | (2.7) | 21.2 | (3.1) | 80.7 | (3.0) | 64.8 | (3.5) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 94.1 | (1.6) | 95.2 | (1.5) | 28.1 | (3.2) | 18.5 | (2.0) | 24.9 | (4.5) | 36.8 | (3.5) | 51.9 | (3.6) | 15.9 | (3.7) | 3.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Turkey | 84.8 | (3.0) | 71.1 | (4.2) | 50.8 | (4.3) | 58.7 | (4.4) | 76.3 | (3.3) | 33.8 | (4.4) | 34.0 | (3.7) | 58.9 | (4.4) | 4.6 | (0.2) |
|  | United States | 98.4 | (0.8) | 76.3 | (2.8) | 65.9 | (3.3) | 90.7 | (1.9) | 93.5 | (1.6) | 54.7 | (3.1) | 92.0 | (1.9) | 80.3 | (2.8) | 6.5 | (0.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 96.5 | (0.3) | 75.5 | (0.5) | 45.8 | (0.6) | 46.2 | (0.6) | 66.5 | (0.6) | 39.5 | (0.6) | 73.8 | (0.6) | 39.6 | (0.6) | 4.8 | (0.0) |
| $\stackrel{\text { ñ }}{\stackrel{5}{2}}$ | Brazil | 87.9 | (2.6) | 83.4 | (2.5) | 44.7 | (4.1) | 37.5 | (3.5) | 75.7 | (3.5) | 55.5 | (3.5) | 92.1 | (2.1) | 23.3 | (2.9) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 98.7 | (0.9) | 96.3 | (1.5) | 63.3 | (4.2) | 22.7 | (4.0) | 90.5 | (2.5) | 63.9 | (4.0) | 96.9 | (1.2) | 18.9 | (3.1) | 5.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 89.2 | (2.4) | 84.3 | (2.6) | 46.4 | (3.8) | 50.6 | (3.8) | 86.0 | (2.7) | 87.3 | (2.5) | 78.8 | (3.2) | 77.2 | (2.9) | 6.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Latvia | 100.0 | c | 94.1 | (2.7) | 40.1 | (4.3) | 79.7 | (4.1) | 99.2 | (0.6) | 86.5 | (2.8) | 96.7 | (1.4) | 65.1 | (4.2) | 6.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 100.0 | c | 96.7 | (0.0) | 57.7 | (0.4) | 28.7 | (0.3) | 17.5 | (0.3) | 39.1 | (0.5) | 21.3 | (0.5) | 39.3 | (0.4) | 4.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 96.5 | (0.1) | 96.5 | (0.1) | 43.4 | (0.2) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 81.4 | (0.2) | 81.5 | (0.3) | 97.5 | (0.1) | 14.5 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 100.0 | c | 96.7 | (1.3) | 55.7 | (4.0) | 69.9 | (4.1) | 96.9 | (1.3) | 98.7 | (0.8) | 98.8 | (0.7) | 81.3 | (3.2) | 7.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Thailand | 89.6 | (2.6) | 71.9 | (4.0) | 77.2 | (3.5) | 59.3 | (3.6) | 88.0 | (3.0) | 70.6 | (3.6) | 76.9 | (3.8) | 56.8 | (4.0) | 5.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 74.8 | (3.4) | 84.3 | (2.9) | 43.6 | (4.3) | 73.1 | (3.6) | 81.8 | (3.4) | 62.7 | (3.7) | 71.9 | (3.2) | 71.7 | (3.4) | 5.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 94.2 | (1.7) | 90.6 | (2.4) | 29.0 | (3.1) | 18.1 | (3.2) | 76.5 | (4.0) | 40.7 | (4.5) | 68.8 | (3.7) | 10.5 | (2.4) | 4.3 | (0.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in national modal grade for $\mathbf{1 5}$-year-olds are used for the following purposes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of assessment practices (sum of "yes" for these eight practices) |  |
|  |  | To inform parents about their child's progress |  | To make decisions about students' retention or promotion |  | To group students for instructional purposes |  | To compare the school to district or national performance |  | To monitor the school's progress from year to year |  | To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness |  | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved |  | To compare the school with other schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | 100.0 | (0.0) | 62.8 | (1.8) | 83.5 | (1.3) | 56.4 | (1.9) | 87.6 | (1.3) | 49.8 | (1.8) | 90.9 | (1.1) | 44.3 | (2.0) | 4.7 | (0.1) |
| - | Austria | 95.5 | (1.7) | 94.2 | (1.7) | 30.5 | (2.4) | 28.5 | (4.0) | 62.6 | (4.2) | 39.1 | (4.1) | 69.6 | (3.6) | 30.0 | (4.1) | 4.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Belgium | 96.6 | (1.3) | 96.2 | (1.3) | 17.2 | (2.3) | 23.3 | (2.6) | 59.8 | (3.2) | 35.2 | (3.0) | 73.1 | (3.0) | 18.3 | (2.3) | 3.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Canada | 99.7 | (0.2) | 95.0 | (1.2) | 74.1 | (2.1) | 82.3 | (1.5) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 30.2 | (1.9) | 86.6 | (1.5) | 62.0 | (2.3) | 5.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 93.1 | (1.7) | 79.4 | (2.9) | 32.8 | (3.3) | 58.2 | (3.2) | 86.2 | (2.7) | 62.8 | (3.4) | 86.3 | (2.7) | 63.1 | (3.2) | 4.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Denmark | 99.2 | (0.4) | 10.3 | (1.9) | 52.3 | (3.4) | 54.9 | (3.5) | 56.8 | (3.3) | 27.1 | (3.1) | 84.7 | (2.4) | 55.9 | (3.5) | 3.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Finland | 98.7 | (0.3) | 93.3 | (1.6) | 17.0 | (2.5) | 45.8 | (3.4) | 59.5 | (3.5) | 15.5 | (2.2) | 60.5 | (3.6) | 21.1 | (2.7) | 3.9 | (0.1) |
|  | France | 97.2 | (1.1) | 96.4 | (1.3) | 42.7 | (3.4) | 62.2 | (2.9) | 73.2 | (3.1) | 22.6 | (3.0) | 50.4 | (3.5) | 40.6 | (3.4) | 4.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Germany | 95.9 | (1.5) | 95.8 | (1.5) | 39.5 | (3.2) | 43.4 | (3.3) | 57.2 | (3.7) | 24.2 | (3.2) | 60.8 | (3.6) | 27.7 | (3.1) | 4.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Greece | 100.0 | c | 98.2 | (1.0) | 8.1 | (2.4) | 17.0 | (2.4) | 55.9 | (3.6) | 14.0 | (2.4) | 49.4 | (3.6) | 21.9 | (2.8) | 3.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Hungary | 93.9 | (1.8) | 69.2 | (3.7) | 47.1 | (3.6) | 78.5 | (3.3) | 92.6 | (2.0) | 57.8 | (3.9) | 77.4 | (3.0) | 71.3 | (3.9) | 4.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Iceland | 100.0 | c | 15.0 | (0.2) | 42.4 | (0.3) | 77.1 | (0.2) | 89.2 | (0.1) | 39.1 | (0.2) | 92.8 | (0.1) | 73.2 | (0.2) | 4.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 100.0 | c | 62.0 | (4.0) | 81.4 | (2.9) | 77.3 | (3.3) | 86.4 | (2.7) | 46.5 | (4.1) | 68.4 | (3.9) | 35.2 | (4.0) | 4.9 | (0.1) |
|  | Italy | 99.3 | (0.4) | 86.6 | (1.8) | 53.4 | (2.0) | 65.1 | (2.2) | 82.0 | (1.6) | 29.6 | (1.9) | 91.7 | (1.2) | 36.6 | (2.1) | 4.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 99.2 | (0.6) | 90.4 | (2.1) | 45.3 | (3.5) | 17.3 | (2.5) | 51.6 | (3.5) | 75.7 | (3.0) | 79.2 | (2.9) | 14.9 | (2.6) | 4.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Korea | 94.7 | (1.9) | 56.3 | (4.2) | 85.6 | (2.8) | 70.2 | (3.6) | 89.9 | (2.6) | 85.3 | (3.0) | 96.3 | (1.6) | 66.8 | (3.8) | 4.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 95.4 | (0.0) | 94.2 | (0.1) | 41.2 | (0.1) | 74.2 | (0.1) | 72.3 | (0.1) | 22.3 | (0.1) | 73.8 | (0.1) | 39.8 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 99.0 | (0.3) | 91.5 | (1.2) | 72.8 | (1.7) | 77.1 | (1.5) | 92.3 | (1.0) | 76.7 | (1.3) | 88.4 | (1.2) | 70.6 | (1.6) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 99.3 | (0.9) | 97.7 | (1.1) | 61.0 | (3.7) | 69.7 | (4.1) | 88.8 | (2.7) | 68.4 | (3.9) | 78.1 | (3.5) | 64.1 | (4.2) | 4.7 | (0.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 100.0 | c | 76.7 | (3.3) | 93.6 | (2.1) | 92.8 | (2.7) | 100.0 | c | 67.7 | (3.8) | 99.4 | (0.5) | 87.5 | (3.4) | 5.5 | (0.2) |
|  | Norway | 98.3 | (1.0) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 47.9 | (3.3) | 68.2 | (3.0) | 83.8 | (2.7) | 30.2 | (3.3) | 73.8 | (3.2) | 51.9 | (3.3) | 4.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Poland | 99.2 | (0.7) | 97.7 | (1.2) | 55.0 | (3.8) | 58.2 | (3.6) | 96.3 | (1.5) | 78.9 | (3.0) | 95.4 | (1.7) | 59.4 | (3.9) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Portugal | 100.0 | c | 98.2 | (1.1) | 40.3 | (4.6) | 85.0 | (3.5) | 95.9 | (1.6) | 50.5 | (3.6) | 93.5 | (2.1) | 63.2 | (4.2) | 5.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 100.0 | c | 93.4 | (1.4) | 38.2 | (3.4) | 64.2 | (3.5) | 70.7 | (3.9) | 69.0 | (3.3) | 83.0 | (2.6) | 69.3 | (3.3) | 4.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Spain | 99.5 | (0.4) | 94.6 | (0.9) | 47.2 | (3.3) | 44.0 | (2.5) | 88.5 | (1.8) | 50.1 | (2.8) | 93.7 | (1.2) | 36.9 | (2.4) | 4.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Sweden | 93.9 | (1.8) | 43.0 | (4.0) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 89.8 | (2.3) | 96.2 | (1.4) | 43.6 | (3.6) | 83.9 | (2.6) | 84.9 | (2.8) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 93.7 | (1.8) | 85.7 | (2.4) | 40.1 | (3.1) | 41.1 | (3.2) | 48.0 | (3.4) | 36.4 | (3.8) | 50.7 | (3.7) | 27.5 | (3.6) | 3.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Turkey | 97.1 | (1.5) | 55.3 | (4.1) | 44.1 | (4.0) | 74.9 | (3.7) | 92.6 | (1.9) | 70.8 | (3.7) | 68.5 | (3.6) | 84.9 | (2.9) | 4.9 | (0.1) |
|  | United States | 98.7 | (1.0) | 56.8 | (4.2) | 74.3 | (3.7) | 93.6 | (2.6) | 95.2 | (2.0) | 59.9 | (4.2) | 94.1 | (1.6) | 86.3 | (2.9) | 5.1 | (0.2) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 97.9 | (0.2) | 74.7 | (0.4) | 49.7 | (0.6) | 61.7 | (0.6) | 79.6 | (0.5) | 48.4 | (0.6) | 80.1 | (0.5) | 52.5 | (0.6) | 4.6 | (0.0) |


| む | Brazil | 97.0 | (0.9) | 91.2 | (1.6) | 47.0 | (2.4) | 83.2 | (1.9) | 97.0 | (0.8) | 79.9 | (2.0) | 88.7 | (1.5) | 56.4 | (2.5) | 5.0 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 98.1 | (1.1) | 98.1 | (1.1) | 86.4 | (2.9) | 44.1 | (4.7) | 96.1 | (1.7) | 80.0 | (3.5) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 30.5 | (3.7) | 5.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 97.1 | (1.7) | 92.8 | (2.1) | 79.6 | (3.2) | 69.0 | (4.3) | 98.1 | (1.3) | 95.8 | (2.1) | 97.1 | (1.6) | 86.9 | (2.9) | 5.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Latvia | 100.0 | c | 96.9 | (1.2) | 38.1 | (3.5) | 92.5 | (1.6) | 99.8 | (0.2) | 92.5 | (1.8) | 99.6 | (0.5) | 85.5 | (2.3) | 5.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 100.0 | c | 71.8 | (1.4) | 49.1 | (1.2) | 68.1 | (1.4) | 66.8 | (1.0) | 20.2 | (1.2) | 69.5 | (1.5) | 59.4 | (0.8) | 5.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 99.4 | (0.0) | 94.9 | (0.0) | 65.2 | (0.1) | 31.9 | (0.0) | 86.7 | (0.1) | 75.3 | (0.1) | 96.5 | (0.0) | 21.4 | (0.0) | 5.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | 99.4 | (0.6) | 94.4 | (1.9) | 56.7 | (4.4) | 93.2 | (1.5) | 99.7 | (0.3) | 99.2 | (0.7) | 99.2 | (0.8) | 97.8 | (1.0) | 5.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Thailand | 99.5 | (0.5) | 86.1 | (2.8) | 79.4 | (2.9) | 85.2 | (2.1) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 91.0 | (2.1) | 95.8 | (1.5) | 75.6 | (3.3) | 5.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 80.0 | (3.4) | 95.4 | (1.9) | 51.6 | (4.4) | 70.7 | (4.0) | 89.1 | (2.6) | 67.1 | (4.1) | 55.9 | (4.3) | 69.1 | (4.4) | 4.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 95.0 | (1.6) | 92.1 | (1.7) | 25.2 | (3.3) | 16.5 | (2.8) | 87.5 | (2.3) | 31.2 | (3.6) | 86.3 | (2.5) | 12.2 | (2.3) | 4.2 | (0.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

［Part 3／3］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in assessment practices
Table IV．4．36 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that assessments of students in national modal grade for 15 －year－olds are used for the following purposes： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of assessment practices（sum of＂yes＂for these eight practices） |  |
|  |  | To inform parents about their child＇s progress |  | To make decisions about students＇ retention or promotion |  | To group students for instructional purposes |  | To compare the school to district or national performance |  | To monitor the school＇s progress from year to year |  | To make judgements about teachers＇ effectiveness |  | To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved |  | To compare the school with other schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | \％dif． | S．E． | Dif． | S．E． |
| 0 | Australia | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | （3．4） | 5.7 | （2．9） | 1.4 | （3．0） | 11.1 | （3．0） | 15.8 | （3．4） | 9.3 | （2．7） | 5.5 | （3．3） | －0．5 | （0．1） |
|  | Austria | 3.4 | （2．8） | 1.0 | （2．9） | －1．3 | （3．4） | 16.1 | （4．9） | 3.4 | （5．8） | 3.5 | （5．3） | 4.0 | （5．2） | －8．0 | （5．7） | －0．3 | （0．2） |
| 0 | Belgium | －3．0 | （1．4） | －2．9 | （1．4） | －2．7 | （3．3） | 13.7 | （3．4） | 22.2 | （4．2） | 15.8 | （3．8） | 7.0 | （4．3） | 11.4 | （2．8） | 0.3 | （0．1） |
|  | Canada | 0.3 | （0．4） | －0．5 | （1．5） | 2.1 | （3．0） | 12.2 | （2．7） | 12.8 | （2．0） | －1．2 | （3．0） | 2.5 | （2．4） | 9.0 | （3．3） | －0．6 | （0．1） |
|  | Czech Republic | －5．2 | （1．9） | －12．4 | （3．5） | －2．4 | （4．7） | 8.2 | （4．6） | 0.6 | （3．6） | 1.2 | （4．8） | －2．4 | （3．4） | 7.9 | （4．9） | －1．1 | （0．2） |
|  | Denmark | 31.5 | （3．5） | 6.5 | （2．1） | 38.2 | （4．3） | 48.9 | （3．8） | 48.3 | （3．9） | 23.4 | （3．4） | 38.0 | （4．5） | 53.0 | （3．7） | 2.4 | （0．1） |
|  | Finland | －1．3 | （0．3） | －2．0 | （1．8） | －0．2 | （3．9） | －10．5 | （5．3） | －5．5 | （5．4） | －16．6 | （4．1） | －5．1 | （5．1） | －13．8 | （4．4） | －0．8 | （0．2） |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | －0．1 | （2．0） | －0．5 | （1．9） | 3.7 | （4．4） | 22.2 | （4．6） | 13.1 | （4．9） | 12.4 | （4．0） | 16.0 | （5．3） | 10.7 | （4．1） | 0.4 | （0．2） |
|  | Greece | 3.4 | c | －1．2 | （1．2） | －3．0 | （3．2） | 4.8 | （3．7） | 20.4 | （6．8） | －1．1 | （5．0） | 8.9 | （6．4） | 6.0 | （4．1） | 0.1 | （0．2） |
|  | Hungary | －5．2 | （2．0） | －25．6 | （4．2） | 12.2 | （5．1） | －7．9 | （4．2） | －3．2 | （2．5） | －19．2 | （5．2） | －16．3 | （3．7） | －6．2 | （5．1） | －1．7 | （0．1） |
|  | Iceland | 0.3 | c | 0.2 | （0．3） | －13．7 | （0．3） | －7．0 | （0．2） | 1.2 | （0．2） | 8.2 | （0．3） | －3．8 | （0．1） | 7.6 | （0．3） | －0．6 | （0．0） |
|  | Ireland | 0.7 | c | 18.3 | （5．8） | 3.3 | （4．4） | 60.1 | （4．6） | 36.9 | （4．8） | 29.6 | （5．2） | 26.2 | （5．8） | 26.4 | （4．7） | 1.3 | （0．2） |
|  | Italy | 3.3 | （1．4） | 3.0 | （3．3） | 1.9 | （4．4） | 32.3 | （4．1） | 12.7 | （3．4） | 6.2 | （3．7） | 7.9 | （3．2） | 7.5 | （3．8） | 0.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Japan | 0.9 | （1．2） | 0.8 | （3．3） | 0.6 | （5．7） | －0．5 | （4．3） | 3.9 | （5．7） | －5．8 | （4．4） | 0.3 | （4．5） | 3.1 | （3．9） | －0．4 | （0．2） |
|  | Korea | －0．8 | （2．6） | 31.5 | （5．6） | 22.9 | （4．9） | 8.2 | （5．2） | 31.3 | （4．7） | 30.8 | （5．2） | 6.2 | （3．2） | 11.9 | （5．4） | －0．2 | （0．2） |
|  | Luxembourg | －4．6 | c | －5．8 | c | 11.5 | （0．1） | 52.4 | （0．1） | 46.2 | （0．1） | 1.3 | （0．1） | 10.9 | （0．1） | 29.5 | （0．1） | 0.7 | （0．0） |
|  | Mexico | 2.3 | （0．9） | －1．5 | （2．1） | 13.4 | （3．6） | 21.6 | （3．5） | 1.2 | （1．9） | －0．6 | （3．4） | －0．8 | （2．5） | 20.1 | （3．9） | －1．0 | （0．1） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．2 | （1．1） | 0.9 | （2．0） | －27．7 | （4．6） | 6.2 | （5．8） | 25.5 | （5．0） | 26.2 | （5．9） | 6.4 | （5．3） | 17.1 | （6．1） | －1．0 | （0．2） |
|  | New Zealand | 1.6 | c | －1．2 | （4．3） | 19.9 | （3．7） | 6.1 | （3．6） | 4.4 | c | 14.8 | （5．1） | 3.6 | （1．3） | 13.9 | （4．7） | －1．0 | （0．2） |
|  | Norway | －1．7 | c | 1.5 | c | 10.1 | （5．2） | 4.4 | （4．7） | 16.1 | （4．3） | 10.7 | （4．5） | 3.7 | （4．7） | 4.7 | （5．1） | 0.2 | （0．2） |
|  | Poland | 1.2 | （1．4） | 13.5 | （3．1） | 22.0 | （5．6） | －12．9 | （5．2） | －0．3 | （2．1） | 5.6 | （4．4） | 7.7 | （3．3） | －2．9 | （5．3） | －1．0 | （0．1） |
|  | Portugal | 1.2 | c | 1.6 | （1．9） | 14.2 | （5．9） | 52.1 | （5．5） | 17.4 | （3．5） | 15.8 | （5．7） | 9.2 | （3．8） | 40.9 | （5．4） | 0.5 | （0．2） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 1.3 | c | －3．2 | （1．8） | －16．8 | （5．2） | 18.3 | （5．1） | －24．3 | （4．2） | －6．0 | （4．2） | －6．0 | （3．4） | 21.7 | （4．5） | －1．4 | （0．2） |
|  | Spain | －0．2 | （0．5） | －4．9 | （1．0） | －0．4 | （4．8） | 25.8 | （3．3） | 19.9 | （3．7） | 14.2 | （4．5） | 5.2 | （2．6） | 19.7 | （3．3） | 0.0 | （0．1） |
|  | Sweden | －2．5 | （2．3） | 4.1 | （5．7） | －20．1 | （5．1） | 16.8 | （3．9） | 10.8 | （3．1） | 22.4 | （4．8） | 3.2 | （3．9） | 20.2 | （4．5） | 0.0 | （0．2） |
|  | Switzerland | －0．4 | （2．3） | －9．5 | （2．8） | 12.0 | （4．5） | 22.5 | （3．8） | 23.0 | （5．7） | －0．3 | （5．1） | －1．2 | （5．2） | 11.5 | （5．1） | 0.1 | （0．2） |
|  | Turkey | 12.4 | （3．3） | －15．7 | （5．8） | －6．7 | （5．9） | 16.2 | （5．7） | 16.3 | （3．8） | 36.9 | （5．7） | 34.5 | （5．2） | 26.0 | （5．3） | 0.2 | （0．2） |
|  | United States | 0.3 | （1．3） | －19．6 | （5．0） | 8.4 | （4．9） | 2.9 | （3．2） | 1.7 | （2．6） | 5.2 | （5．2） | 2.1 | （2．5） | 6.0 | （4．1） | －1．4 | （0．2） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 1.4 | （0．4） | －0．8 | （0．7） | 3.8 | （0．8） | 15.5 | （0．8） | 13.1 | （0．6） | 8.9 | （0．8） | 6.3 | （0．8） | 12.9 | （0．8） | －0．2 | （0．0） |
|  | Brazil | 9.2 | （2．8） | 7.8 | （3．0） | 2.3 | （4．7） | 45.6 | （4．0） | 21.3 | （3．6） | 24.3 | （4．0） | －3．4 | （2．5） | 33.2 | （3．8） | 0.0 | （0．2） |
| 悲 | Hong Kong－China | －0．6 | （1．4） | 1.9 | （1．9） | 23.1 | （5．0） | 21.3 | （6．1） | 5.5 | （3．0） | 16.1 | （5．3） | 2.5 | （1．3） | 11.5 | （4．9） | －0．1 | （0．2） |
|  | Indonesia | 7.9 | （3．0） | 8.5 | （3．3） | 33.2 | （5．0） | 18.4 | （5．7） | 12.1 | （3．0） | 8.5 | （3．3） | 18.3 | （3．5） | 9.6 | （4．1） | －0．6 | （0．3） |
|  | Latvia | 0.0 | c | 2.8 | （2．9） | －1．9 | （5．5） | 12.7 | （4．4） | 0.6 | （0．7） | 6.1 | （3．4） | 2.8 | （1．5） | 20.4 | （4．8） | －1．1 | （0．1） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 | c | －25．0 | （1．4） | －8．6 | （1．3） | 39.4 | （1．4） | 49.4 | （1．0） | －18．9 | （1．3） | 48.2 | （1．6） | 20.1 | （0．9） | 1.0 | （0．0） |
|  | Macao－China | 2.8 | （0．1） | －1．6 | （0．1） | 21.9 | （0．2） | 28.8 | （0．1） | 5.2 | （0．2） | －6．2 | （0．3） | －1．0 | （0．1） | 6.9 | （0．2） | 0.1 | （0．0） |
|  | Russian Federation | －0．6 | c | －2．3 | （2．4） | 1.0 | （5．9） | 23.3 | （4．4） | 2.7 | （1．3） | 0.5 | （1．1） | 0.4 | （1．1） | 16.5 | （3．4） | －1．2 | （0．1） |
|  | Thailand | 9.8 | （2．6） | 14.1 | （4．9） | 2.2 | （4．5） | 25.9 | （4．2） | 9.3 | （3．2） | 20.3 | （4．1） | 18.9 | （4．0） | 18.8 | （5．2） | －0．6 | （0．3） |
|  | Tunisia | 5.1 | （4．8） | 11.1 | （3．5） | 8.0 | （6．2） | －2．4 | （5．4） | 7.2 | （4．2） | 4.4 | （5．5） | －16．0 | （5．4） | －2．7 | （5．5） | －0．8 | （0．2） |
|  | Uruguay | 0.7 | （2．4） | 1.5 | （2．9） | －3．8 | （4．5） | －1．7 | （4．2） | 11.0 | （4．6） | －9．5 | （5．7） | 17.5 | （4．5） | 1.7 | （3．4） | 0.0 | （0．1） |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 槅页http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957498

Change between 2003 and 2012 in monitoring mathematics teachers＇practice
Table IV．4．37 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 <br> （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers at their schools： |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers at their schools： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following methods have been used to monitor the practice of mathematics teachers at their schools： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { dif. } \end{aligned}$ | S．E． | \% dif. | S．E． | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \% \\ \text { dif. } \end{array}$ | S．E． | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \% \\ \text { dif. } \end{array}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 58.7 （3．1） | 65.0 | （3．3） | 63.4 | （2．6） | 7.8 | （1．9） | 78.8 | （1．5） | 77.4 | （1．5） | 70.0 | （1．8） | 10.9 | （1．3） | 20.0 | （3．5） | 12.4 | （3．6） | 6.6 | （3．1） | 3.1 | （2．3） |
|  | Austria | 25.3 （3．7） | 78.5 | （3．6） | 77.9 | （3．3） | 37.1 | （3．4） | 91.0 | （2．1） | 78.6 | （3．4） | 73.9 | （3．5） | 29.2 | （3．1） | 65.7 | （4．3） | 0.1 | （4．9） | －4．0 | （4．8） | －7．8 | （4．6） |
|  | Belgium | 40.9 （3．0） | 61.7 | （3．0） | 57.8 | （3．2） | 47.5 | （3．1） | 65.6 | （3．2） | 76.3 | （2．4） | 65.0 | （3．2） | 48.0 | （2．8） | 24.7 | （4．3） | 14.5 | （3．9） | 7.2 | （4．5） | 0.5 | （4．2） |
|  | Canada | m m | m | m | 86.9 | （1．2） | 10.1 | （1．2） | 72.9 | （2．3） | 60.0 | （2．1） | 81.9 | （1．6） | 20.6 | （2．2） | m | m | m | m | －5．0 | （2．0） | 10.5 | （2．5） |
|  | Czech Republic | 73.4 （3．1） | 63.0 | （2．9） | 99.3 | （0．4） | 31.5 | （2．9） | 92.0 | （2．3） | 66.6 | （3．7） | 98.0 | （0．8） | 32.7 | （3．8） | 18.5 | （3．9） | 3.6 | （4．7） | －1．3 | （0．9） | 1.3 | （4．8） |
|  | Denmark | 12.8 （2．6） | 31.1 | （3．5） | 63.0 | （3．3） | 11.3 | （2．3） | 75.1 | （2．8） | 40.9 | （3．6） | 64.3 | （3．8） | 16.8 | （2．5） | 62.2 | （3．8） | 9.7 | （5．0） | 1.3 | （5．1） | 5.6 | （3．4） |
|  | Finland | 47.2 （3．8） | 35.0 | （3．8） | 34.4 | （3．4） | 3.8 | （1．6） | 39.6 | （3．2） | 19.1 | （2．9） | 31.3 | （2．5） | 2.2 | （0．8） | －7．6 | （5．0） | －15．9 | （4．8） | －3．1 | （4．2） | －1．6 | （1．8） |
|  | France | w w | w | w | w | w | w | w | 60.5 | （3．4） | 42.5 | （3．5） | 12.3 | （2．3） | 72.9 | （3．3） | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 61.6 （3．2） | 25.3 | （3．1） | 69.4 | （3．3） | 25.7 | （2．8） | 72.1 | （3．3） | 44.6 | （3．0） | 66.9 | （3．3） | 22.1 | （3．0） | 10.5 | （4．7） | 19.3 | （4．3） | －2．5 | （4．7） | －3．6 | （4．1） |
|  | Greece | 34.5 （5．7） |  | （1．9） | 7.2 | （3．4） | 16.1 | （4．1） | 59.7 | （3．7） | 26.0 | （3．5） | 8.3 | （2．3） | 20.6 | （3．0） | 25.2 | （6．8） | 21.4 | （4．0） | 1.0 | （4．1） | 4.5 | （5．1） |
|  | Hungary | 62.6 （4．1） | 83.1 | （3．0） | 95.8 | （1．5） | 26.0 | （3．9） | 74.3 | （3．6） | 74.5 | （3．1） | 96.7 | （1．3） | 13.0 | （2．4） | 11.7 | （5．4） | －8．6 | （4．3） | 0.9 | （2．0） | －12．9 | （4．5） |
|  | Iceland | 80.3 （0．2） | 12.6 | （0．1） | 46.7 | （0．2） | 1.8 | （0．1） | 84.2 | （0．2） | 12.1 | （0．2） | 46.4 | （0．2） | 25.3 | （0．2） | 3.9 | （0．2） | －0．5 | （0．2） | －0．2 | （0．3） | 23.5 | （0．2） |
|  | Ireland | 42.0 （4．3） |  | （2．7） | 6.6 | （2．3） | 4.7 | （1．6） | 65.3 | （3．9） | 33.7 | （3．6） | 12.7 | （2．4） | 48.5 | （3．9） | 23.3 | （5．8） | 24.4 | （4．5） | 6.1 | （3．4） | 43.8 | （4．2） |
|  | Italy | 44.4 （3．8） | 84.0 | （2．8） | 16.1 | （2．8） | 1.2 | （0．8） | 74.1 | （1．8） | 87.4 | （1．7） | 17.2 | （1．4） | 0.6 | （0．2） | 29.7 | （4．1） | 3.3 | （3．3） | 1.1 | （3．1） | －0．5 | （0．8） |
|  | Japan | 56.9 （4．0） | 51.2 | （4．3） | 55.9 | （4．4） | 15.1 | （3．0） | 69.4 | （3．3） | 54.2 | （3．4） | 81.0 | （2．6） | 26.5 | （3．1） | 12.5 | （5．2） | 3.1 | （5．4） | 25.1 | （5．1） | 11.4 | （4．3） |
|  | Korea | 70.6 （3．2） | 73.2 | （3．7） | 90.1 | （2．6） | 61.9 | （3．4） | 84.1 | （3．1） | 98.7 | （0．9） | 96.0 | （1．7） | 68.5 | （3．8） | 13.5 | （4．5） | 25.5 | （3．8） | 5.9 | （3．1） | 6.6 | （5．1） |
|  | Luxembourg | 58.9 （0．1） | 27.2 | （0．1） | 42.2 | （0．1） | 7.3 | （0．0） | 80.6 | （0．1） | 63.3 | （0．1） | 47.9 | （0．1） | 6.4 | （0．0） | 21.7 | （0．1） | 36.1 | （0．1） | 5.7 | （0．1） | －0．9 | （0．0） |
|  | Mexico | 92.2 （1．6） | 62.8 | （3．3） | 72.1 | （2．6） | 36.3 | （3．2） | 92.5 | （0．9） | 76.4 | （1．7） | 76.6 | （1．3） | 41.1 | （1．7） | 0.3 | （1．8） | 13.6 | （3．7） | 4.5 | （2．9） | 4.7 | （3．7） |
|  | Netherlands | 54.1 （4．2） | 52.0 | （4．9） | 58.4 | （4．8） | 33.3 | （4．3） | 83.2 | （3．6） | 54.0 | （4．6） | 86.6 | （3．1） | 41.9 | （4．5） | 29.1 | （5．6） | 2.0 | （6．7） | 28.3 | （5．7） | 8.6 | （6．2） |
|  | New Zealand | 73.0 | 91.2 | （2．2） | 94.3 | （1．7） | 52.4 | （3．2） | 84.1 | （3．5） | 91.7 | （2．3） | 96.6 | （1．1） | 32.3 | （3．4） | 11.1 | （4．6） | 0.5 | （3．2） | 2.3 | （2．0） | －20．2 | （4．7） |
|  | Norway | 49.1 （3．9） | 35.3 | （3．8） | 25.9 | （3．3） | 6.9 | （2．2） | 72.4 | （2．7） | 53.9 | （4．1） | 47.7 | （3．7） | 10.9 | （2．2） | 23.3 | （4．7） | 18.7 | （5．6） | 21.8 | （5．0） | 4.0 | （3．1） |
|  | Poland | 94.9 （1．8） | 71.9 | （3．6） | 97.4 | （1．3） | 13.7 | （2．6） | 100.0 | c | 64.4 | （4．0） | 94.4 | （1．8） | 16.2 | （3．1） | 5.1 | C | －7．5 | （5．4） | －3．0 | （2．2） | 2.5 | （4．0） |
|  | Portugal | 32.9 （4．7） | 58.0 | （4．7） | 4.9 | （1．6） | 9.6 | （2．8） | 98.2 | （1．1） | 71.3 | （4．6） | 60.2 | （3．4） | 4.2 | （2．2） | 65.2 | （4．8） | 13.3 | （6．6） | 55.3 | （3．8） | －5．4 | （3．6） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 70.1 （3．0） | 87.9 | （2．2） | 97.8 | （1．0） | 24.6 | （3．0） | 74.6 | （3．2） | 84.2 | （3．0） | 98.2 | （0．8） | 27.0 | （3．4） | 4.5 | （4．4） | －3．7 | （3．7） | 0.4 | （1．3） | 2.4 | （4．5） |
|  | Spain | 71.9 （3．2） | 39.1 | （3．5） | 14.8 | （2．6） | 14.1 | （2．5） | 78.0 | （2．5） | 21.9 | （2．2） | 9.6 | （1．4） | 15.5 | （2．4） | 6.2 | （4．1） | －17．2 | （4．2） | －5．2 | （3．0） | 1.3 | （3．5） |
|  | Sweden | 41.4 （4．0） | 21.3 | （3．0） | 58.4 | （3．4） | 15.7 | （2．4） | 67.5 | （3．5） | 58.7 | （3．7） | 79.7 | （3．2） | 26.9 | （3．4） | 26.1 | （5．3） | 37.4 | （4．8） | 21.3 | （4．6） | 11.3 | （4．1） |
|  | Switzerland | 42.7 （3．6） | 45.7 | （3．9） | 41.8 | （4．3） | 58.8 | （4．0） | 60.6 | （3．0） | 62.9 | （3．3） | 83.0 | （2．2） | 28.7 | （2．7） | 17.9 | （4．7） | 17.2 | （5．1） | 41.2 | （4．9） | －30．0 | （4．8） |
|  | Turkey | 72.3 （4．2） | 77.0 | （4．0） | 89.3 | （2．6） | 39.5 | （4．3） | 91.6 | （2．7） | 51.8 | （3．8） | 93.9 | （1．9） | 22.1 | （3．6） | 19.3 | （5．0） | －25．2 | （5．5） | 4.6 | （3．2） | －17．4 | （5．6） |
|  | United States | 89.2 （2．2） | 59.6 | （3．2） | 99.7 | （0．3） | 37.2 | （3．6） | 89.4 | （2．7） | 65.9 | （3．7） | 99.7 | （0．3） | 42.0 | （4．5） | 0.2 | （3．5） | 6.4 | （4．9） | 0.0 | （0．5） | 4.8 | （5．8） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 57.5 （0．7） | 51.6 | （0．6） | 59.6 | （0．5） | 23.2 | （0．5） | 77.5 | （0．6） | 59.0 | （0．6） | 67.3 | （0．4） | 25.0 | （0．5） | 20.1 | （0．9） | 7.4 | （0．9） | 7.7 | （0．7） | 1.8 | （0．8） |


| 资 | Brazil | 75.4 | （3．3） | 53.8 | （3．3） | 49.6 | （3．7） | 11.5 | （2．2） | 88.3 | （1．4） | 74.8 | （2．2） | 49.8 | （2．1） | 22.8 | （2．4） | 12.8 | （3．6） | 21.0 | （4．0） | 0.2 | （4．2） | 11.3 | （3．3） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 82.4 | （3．5） | 86.0 | （2．8） | 92.2 | （2．4） | 26.2 | （3．5） | 94.9 | （1．8） | 85.0 | （3．1） | 96.7 | （1．5） | 39.0 | （4．1） | 12.5 | （3．9） | －1．0 | （4．2） | 4.5 | （2．8） | 12.9 | （5．4） |
|  | Indonesia | 91.3 | （1．9） | 66.9 | （4．0） | 91.6 | （2．2） | 75.0 | （3．4） | 91.3 | （2．4） | 91.3 | （1．6） | 95.4 | （1．5） | 77.1 | （3．6） | －0．1 | （3．1） | 24.5 | （4．3） | 3.9 | （2．7） | 2.1 | （4．9） |
|  | Latvia | 94.8 | （2．3） | 97.5 | （1．3） | 99.5 | （0．5） | 41.4 | （4．9） | 83.2 | （2．8） | 89.3 | （2．3） | 100.0 | c | 41.0 | （3．1） | －11．6 | （3．6） | －8．2 | （2．7） | 0.5 | c | －0．3 | （5．8） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 59.2 | （0．5） | 52.7 | （0．5） | 5.0 | （0．3） | 96.2 | （0．3） | 82.4 | （0．7） | 69.6 | （1．0） | 49.4 | （0．8） | 86.9 | （0．6） | 23.2 | （0．8） | 16.9 | （1．1） | 44.3 | （0．8） | －9．2 | （0．7） |
|  | Macao－China | 87.5 | （0．1） | 95.5 | （0．2） | 95.0 | （0．0） | 29.9 | （0．3） | 89.9 | （0．0） | 88.0 | （0．1） | 96.0 | （0．0） | 47.9 | （0．0） | 2.4 | （0．1） | －7．5 | （0．2） | 1.1 | （0．1） | 18.0 | （0．3） |
|  | Russian Federation | 95.5 | （1．6） | 98.4 | （1．0） | 100.0 | C | 73.8 | （3．3） | 98.9 | （0．5） | 95.9 | （1．1） | 99.5 | （0．3） | 43.8 | （4．2） | 3.5 | （1．7） | －2．5 | （1．5） | －0．5 | c | －30．0 | （5．3） |
|  | Thailand | 91.1 | （2．0） | 85.4 | （2．5） | 87.1 | （2．7） | 49.3 | （3．7） | 97.9 | （1．1） | 92.5 | （2．1） | 95.1 | （1．6） | 44.7 | （4．3） | 6.8 | （2．3） | 7.1 | （3．3） | 8.0 | （3．2） | －4．6 | （5．7） |
|  | Tunisia | 79.0 | （3．6） | 60.1 | （4．0） | 74.2 | （3．6） | 80.4 | （3．4） | 75.0 | （3．8） | 39.6 | （3．9） | 50.1 | （4．1） | 86.9 | （2．7） | －4．0 | （5．2） | －20．5 | （5．6） | －24．1 | （5．5） | 6.5 | （4．3） |
|  | Uruguay | 50.7 | （4．0） | 63.2 | （3．2） | 92.4 | （1．6） | 51.9 | （3．7） | 57.8 | （3．9） | 63.3 | （3．6） | 88.4 | （2．2） | 66.2 | （3．2） | 7.0 | （5．6） | 0.1 | （4．8） | －4．1 | （2．7） | 14.2 | （4．8） |

[^35][Part 1/1]
Arriving late for school
Table IV.5.1 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Percentage of students who reported having arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all |  | One or two times |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 64.5 | (0.6) | 25.4 | (0.5) | 6.6 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (0.2) |
| Austria | 79.1 | (0.9) | 15.6 | (0.7) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) |
| Belgium | 72.7 | (0.7) | 20.8 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 2.8 | (0.2) |
| Canada | 56.9 | (0.7) | 28.6 | (0.5) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 5.4 | (0.3) |
| Chile | 47.0 | (1.1) | 35.0 | (0.7) | 10.5 | (0.5) | 7.5 | (0.5) |
| Czech Republic | 73.0 | (0.8) | 20.7 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.3) | 3.0 | (0.3) |
| Denmark | 61.5 | (1.1) | 26.3 | (0.7) | 7.5 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) |
| Estonia | 58.9 | (0.9) | 29.1 | (0.7) | 7.8 | (0.4) | 4.2 | (0.4) |
| Finland | 57.0 | (0.9) | 30.8 | (0.7) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 4.0 | (0.3) |
| France | 67.7 | (0.9) | 24.4 | (0.7) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 2.8 | (0.3) |
| Germany | 77.3 | (0.8) | 17.8 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.2) |
| Greece | 50.7 | (1.0) | 29.3 | (0.7) | 10.5 | (0.5) | 9.4 | (0.4) |
| Hungary | 75.9 | (1.2) | 18.6 | (1.0) | 2.9 | (0.4) | 2.6 | (0.3) |
| Iceland | 65.0 | (0.8) | 26.8 | (0.8) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.2) |
| Ireland | 72.6 | (1.0) | 20.1 | (0.7) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.3) |
| Israel | 45.7 | (1.1) | 35.7 | (0.8) | 11.0 | (0.6) | 7.7 | (0.5) |
| Italy | 64.8 | (0.6) | 26.3 | (0.5) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (0.2) |
| Japan | 91.1 | (0.6) | 7.5 | (0.5) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
| Korea | 74.9 | (1.0) | 17.3 | (0.7) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.3) |
| Luxembourg | 70.9 | (0.5) | 21.4 | (0.5) | 4.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.2) |
| Mexico | 60.1 | (0.6) | 31.9 | (0.5) | 5.9 | (0.2) | 2.1 | (0.1) |
| Netherlands | 69.7 | (1.0) | 23.4 | (0.8) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.3) |
| New Zealand | 57.9 | (1.3) | 28.0 | (0.8) | 8.9 | (0.6) | 5.2 | (0.3) |
| Norway | 70.8 | (1.0) | 21.2 | (0.7) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 3.1 | (0.3) |
| Poland | 57.6 | (1.2) | 28.2 | (0.7) | 8.0 | (0.5) | 6.2 | (0.5) |
| Portugal | 44.8 | (1.0) | 39.0 | (0.7) | 10.2 | (0.5) | 6.0 | (0.4) |
| Slovak Republic | 73.8 | (0.9) | 20.1 | (0.8) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.3) |
| Slovenia | 60.4 | (0.8) | 29.1 | (0.7) | 5.9 | (0.4) | 4.5 | (0.3) |
| Spain | 64.7 | (0.8) | 24.3 | (0.6) | 6.5 | (0.2) | 4.4 | (0.2) |
| Sweden | 44.4 | (1.0) | 34.3 | (0.7) | 12.9 | (0.5) | 8.4 | (0.5) |
| Switzerland | 75.7 | (0.8) | 19.4 | (0.6) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.1) |
| Turkey | 56.2 | (1.0) | 30.1 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.5) | 5.3 | (0.4) |
| United Kingdom | 68.2 | (0.8) | 24.0 | (0.6) | 5.1 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.2) |
| United States | 69.9 | (1.2) | 21.8 | (0.8) | 5.1 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.4) |
| OECD average | 64.7 | (0.2) | 25.1 | (0.1) | 6.2 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (0.1) |
| Albania | 64.7 | (0.7) | 27.8 | (0.6) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 2.6 | (0.3) |
| Argentina | 53.0 | (1.3) | 28.6 | (0.8) | 9.9 | (0.6) | 8.5 | (0.6) |
| ๕ Brazil | 66.3 | (0.8) | 24.8 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.3) | 3.4 | (0.2) |
| Bulgaria | 41.0 | (1.1) | 37.0 | (0.7) | 12.7 | (0.6) | 9.3 | (0.7) |
| Colombia | 64.1 | (1.4) | 29.0 | (1.1) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 2.2 | (0.3) |
| Costa Rica | 42.5 | (1.1) | 37.9 | (0.9) | 12.2 | (0.7) | 7.3 | (0.6) |
| Croatia | 66.1 | (0.9) | 26.0 | (0.7) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.3) |
| Cyprus* | 52.3 | (0.7) | 28.0 | (0.6) | 10.6 | (0.5) | 9.1 | (0.4) |
| Hong Kong-China | 85.4 | (0.6) | 12.5 | (0.5) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
| Indonesia | 73.0 | (1.0) | 22.2 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.3) |
| Jordan | 64.6 | (0.8) | 25.1 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.4) | 4.8 | (0.4) |
| Kazakhstan | 71.8 | (1.2) | 23.6 | (0.9) | 3.3 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
| Latvia | 43.7 | (1.2) | 35.0 | (0.9) | 12.7 | (0.6) | 8.6 | (0.7) |
| Liechtenstein | 81.3 | (2.3) | 16.5 | (2.1) | 1.0 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.6) |
| Lithuania | 56.3 | (1.2) | 31.2 | (0.9) | 7.5 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) |
| Macao-China | 74.9 | (0.5) | 20.9 | (0.5) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) |
| Malaysia | 66.4 | (1.0) | 23.3 | (0.8) | 6.2 | (0.3) | 4.1 | (0.3) |
| Montenegro | 60.6 | (0.9) | 29.7 | (0.8) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 4.4 | (0.3) |
| Peru | 47.2 | (1.2) | 36.2 | (0.9) | 11.0 | (0.5) | 5.7 | (0.5) |
| Qatar | 60.5 | (0.5) | 26.9 | (0.4) | 7.5 | (0.2) | 5.1 | (0.2) |
| Romania | 54.2 | (1.1) | 31.4 | (0.8) | 7.8 | (0.5) | 6.6 | (0.5) |
| Russian Federation | 53.3 | (1.3) | 30.9 | (0.8) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 7.6 | (0.5) |
| Serbia | 58.2 | (1.0) | 30.4 | (0.8) | 6.6 | (0.4) | 4.8 | (0.4) |
| Shanghai-China | 83.4 | (0.7) | 13.1 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
| Singapore | 79.4 | (0.5) | 16.9 | (0.5) | 2.4 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) |
| Chinese Taipei | 77.7 | (0.8) | 14.7 | (0.6) | 4.5 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) |
| Thailand | 65.9 | (1.2) | 24.0 | (0.8) | 6.3 | (0.5) | 3.8 | (0.3) |
| Tunisia | 48.2 | (0.9) | 38.4 | (0.8) | 7.6 | (0.4) | 5.8 | (0.5) |
| United Arab Emirates | 68.5 | (0.7) | 22.8 | (0.5) | 5.0 | (0.2) | 3.8 | (0.3) |
| Uruguay | 40.7 | (0.9) | 38.1 | (0.7) | 12.6 | (0.5) | 8.6 | (0.5) |
| Viet Nam | 83.8 | (0.8) | 14.2 | (0.7) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Table IV．5．2 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Percentage of students who are in schools where，in the two weeks prior to the PISA test．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Over $50 \%$ of students arrived late at least once |  | More than $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ but $\mathbf{5 0} \%$ of students or fewer arrived late at least once |  | More than $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ but $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ of students or fewer arrived late at least once |  | $10 \%$ of students or fewer arrived late at least once |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
|  | Australia | 17.2 | （1．4） | 57.0 | （1．9） | 22.9 | （1．7） | 2.9 | （0．7） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Austria | 5.4 | （1．8） | 29.2 | （3．3） | 34.6 | （4．1） | 30.8 | （3．2） |
|  | Belgium | 6.7 | （1．3） | 46.1 | （3．0） | 38.9 | （3．2） | 8.2 | （1．7） |
|  | Canada | 31.6 | （2．3） | 53.7 | （2．7） | 13.5 | （1．3） | 1.3 | （0．4） |
|  | Chile | 53.4 | （3．5） | 44.9 | （3．4） | 1.4 | （0．5） | 0.3 | （0．2） |
|  | Czech Republic | 8.2 | （1．6） | 39.7 | （2．8） | 39.2 | （3．2） | 12.8 | （2．2） |
|  | Denmark | 23.0 | （2．8） | 52.3 | （3．3） | 20.6 | （2．8） | 4.1 | （1．5） |
|  | Estonia | 27.4 | （2．5） | 54.7 | （3．1） | 12.7 | （1．8） | 5.2 | （1．3） |
|  | Finland | 33.3 | （3．3） | 52.6 | （3．7） | 13.0 | （2．4） | 1.0 | （0．5） |
|  | France | 13.9 | （2．3） | 47.5 | （3．3） | 31.6 | （3．0） | 6.9 | （1．6） |
|  | Germany | 4.2 | （1．3） | 35.2 | （3．4） | 42.4 | （3．2） | 18.2 | （2．4） |
|  | Greece | 51.7 | （4．0） | 44.4 | （4．1） | 2.3 | （1．1） | 1.6 | （0．9） |
|  | Hungary | 10.2 | （1．9） | 28.9 | （3．5） | 34.0 | （3．5） | 26.9 | （2．8） |
|  | Iceland | 12.2 | （0．1） | 65.9 | （0．2） | 18.4 | （0．2） | 3.5 | （0．1） |
|  | Ireland | 5.6 | （1．7） | 43.3 | （3．5） | 45.5 | （3．5） | 5.6 | （1．8） |
|  | Israel | 59.1 | （3．8） | 37.6 | （3．8） | 3.3 | （1．4） | 0.0 | （0．0） |
|  | Italy | 17.7 | （1．6） | 56.7 | （2．0） | 22.2 | （1．6） | 3.3 | （0．8） |
|  | Japan | 0.2 | （0．2） | 6.2 | （1．7） | 28.4 | （3．3） | 65.2 | （3．7） |
|  | Korea | 5.1 | （1．5） | 44.9 | （3．7） | 34.9 | （3．7） | 15.0 | （2．8） |
|  | Luxembourg | 3.5 | （0．1） | 51.9 | （0．1） | 44.1 | （0．1） | 0.5 | （0．0） |
|  | Mexico | 27.0 | （1．7） | 54.4 | （1．8） | 15.5 | （1．4） | 3.1 | （0．6） |
|  | Netherlands | 11.9 | （2．3） | 44.4 | （3．8） | 40.8 | （3．9） | 3.0 | （1．2） |
|  | New Zealand | 30.1 | （3．5） | 56.2 | （4．3） | 13.3 | （3．0） | 0.4 | （0．3） |
|  | Norway | 7.4 | （1．9） | 55.2 | （3．6） | 30.8 | （3．4） | 6.6 | （1．7） |
|  | Poland | 32.6 | （3．5） | 45.7 | （3．9） | 19.2 | （3．2） | 2.4 | （1．2） |
|  | Portugal | 64.8 | （4．0） | 34.1 | （3．9） | 1.0 | （0．8） | 0.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Slovak Republic | 6.0 | （1．2） | 43.1 | （3．7） | 39.9 | （3．8） | 11.1 | （2．2） |
|  | Slovenia | 23.4 | （0．5） | 65.9 | （0．7） | 7.9 | （0．2） | 2.8 | （0．6） |
|  | Spain | 17.5 | （2．0） | 55.1 | （3．2） | 24.6 | （2．7） | 2.7 | （0．8） |
|  | Sweden | 65.7 | （3．4） | 31.9 | （3．3） | 2.1 | （1．1） | 0.3 | （0．2） |
|  | Switzerland | 5.2 | （1．3） | 36.1 | （2．8） | 42.6 | （3．4） | 16.1 | （2．3） |
|  | Turkey | 27.0 | （4．2） | 66.3 | （4．3） | 6.6 | （1．8） | 0.1 | （0．0） |
|  | United Kingdom | 7.7 | （1．6） | 59.5 | （3．2） | 28.5 | （2．8） | 4.3 | （1．4） |
|  | United States | 9.5 | （2．2） | 49.2 | （4．3） | 34.5 | （4．3） | 6.8 | （2．0） |
|  | OECD average | 21.3 | （0．4） | 46.8 | （0．6） | 23.9 | （0．5） | 8.0 | （0．3） |
|  | Albania | 7.3 | （1．6） | 75.8 | （3．0） | 14.7 | （2．6） | 2.2 | （0．9） |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Argentina | 47.3 | （4．0） | 41.2 | （3．6） | 11.3 | （2．5） | 0.2 | （0．2） |
|  | Brazil | 14.8 | （1．8） | 50.9 | （2．7） | 32.0 | （2．4） | 2.3 | （0．8） |
|  | Bulgaria | 71.2 | （3．6） | 28.0 | （3．8） | 0.7 | （0．7） | 0.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Colombia | 17.3 | （2．8） | 58.0 | （3．7） | 18.0 | （2．9） | 6.7 | （2．3） |
|  | Costa Rica | 70.0 | （3．0） | 25.4 | （3．0） | 4.5 | （1．5） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Croatia | 13.5 | （2．2） | 59.3 | （3．5） | 22.5 | （2．8） | 4.6 | （1．8） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 47.0 | （0．1） | 49.4 | （0．1） | 3.5 | （0．1） | 0.1 | （0．0） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 0.1 | （0．1） | 11.4 | （2．4） | 54.1 | （3．7） | 34.4 | （3．3） |
|  | Indonesia | 9.0 | （1．9） | 39.2 | （3．5） | 41.9 | （3．5） | 9.9 | （2．3） |
|  | Jordan | 15.7 | （2．5） | 59.9 | （3．7） | 21.7 | （3．0） | 2.6 | （1．3） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 10.5 | （2．3） | 44.2 | （3．9） | 32.5 | （3．6） | 12.7 | （2．1） |
|  | Latvia | 65.9 | （3．4） | 29.7 | （3．2） | 3.4 | （1．3） | 1.0 | （0．6） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 1.0 | （0．6） | 18.8 | （0．9） | 73.5 | （1．0） | 6.7 | （0．5） |
|  | Lithuania | 35.4 | （3．4） | 50.7 | （3．7） | 10.8 | （2．0） | 3.1 | （0．8） |
|  | Macao－China | 8.2 | （0．1） | 34.0 | （0．0） | 46.8 | （0．1） | 10.9 | （0．0） |
|  | Malaysia | 10.9 | （2．3） | 61.5 | （3．7） | 25.0 | （3．3） | 2.5 | （1．4） |
|  | Montenegro | 10.2 | （0．1） | 83.1 | （0．1） | 6.3 | （0．1） | 0.4 | （0．0） |
|  | Peru | 56.8 | （3．5） | 39.0 | （3．3） | 4.2 | （1．5） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Qatar | 18.3 | （0．1） | 68.6 | （0．1） | 11.5 | （0．1） | 1.6 | （0．0） |
|  | Romania | 40.0 | （3．6） | 47.6 | （3．9） | 11.3 | （2．5） | 1.0 | （0．5） |
|  | Russian Federation | 39.6 | （4．0） | 48.9 | （4．6） | 9.2 | （2．3） | 2.3 | （0．4） |
|  | Serbia | 31.6 | （3．6） | 52.5 | （4．2） | 14.7 | （2．8） | 1.3 | （0．9） |
|  | Shanghai－China | 0.0 | c | 17.9 | （2．5） | 55.8 | （3．5） | 26.2 | （3．6） |
|  | Singapore | 1.0 | （0．0） | 32.0 | （0．5） | 48.9 | （0．5） | 18.0 | （0．1） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 1.4 | （0．8） | 38.8 | （3．7） | 45.7 | （4．4） | 14.1 | （2．8） |
|  | Thailand | 20.9 | （2．6） | 43.0 | （3．7） | 31.0 | （3．8） | 5.1 | （1．7） |
|  | Tunisia | 55.9 | （4．0） | 43.2 | （4．1） | 0.9 | （0．8） | 0.0 | c |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 11.5 | （1．9） | 52.9 | （2．7） | 31.4 | （2．1） | 4.2 | （0．6） |
|  | Uruguay | 79.1 | （2．6） | 18.6 | （2．5） | 1.5 | （0．9） | 0.8 | （0．8） |
|  | Viet Nam | 1.3 | （0．6） | 18.6 | （2．9） | 43.8 | （4．2） | 36.3 | （4．0） |

＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 京要红 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957517
[Part 1/1]
Skipping a day of school or some classes
Table IV.5.3 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Percentage of students who reported having skipped a day of school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students who reported having skipped some classes in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all |  | One or two times |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Three } \\ \text { or four times } \end{gathered}$ |  | Five or more times |  | Not at all |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { One } \\ \text { or two times } \end{gathered}$ |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 68.2 | (0.6) | 25.7 | (0.5) | 4.3 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 86.5 | (0.4) | 10.4 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) |
| Austria | 92.0 | (0.5) | 7.1 | (0.5) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 87.2 | (0.8) | 11.4 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
| Belgium | 94.4 | (0.4) | 4.2 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 91.8 | (0.4) | 6.8 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
| Canada | 77.9 | (0.6) | 18.9 | (0.4) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 75.4 | (0.5) | 19.1 | (0.4) | 3.7 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.2) |
| Chile | 92.3 | (0.5) | 6.5 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 84.6 | (0.8) | 13.8 | (0.7) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
| Czech Republic | 94.1 | (0.5) | 4.1 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 92.6 | (0.5) | 6.5 | (0.5) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
| Denmark | 90.4 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.5) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 83.7 | (0.9) | 13.7 | (0.7) | 1.8 | (0.3) | 0.9 | (0.2) |
| Estonia | 84.7 | (0.7) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 70.1 | (0.9) | 23.2 | (0.7) | 4.5 | (0.3) | 2.3 | (0.3) |
| Finland | 89.6 | (0.5) | 8.9 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 84.4 | (0.6) | 13.1 | (0.5) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
| France | 90.5 | (0.6) | 7.3 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 83.2 | (0.8) | 13.8 | (0.7) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
| Germany | 94.9 | (0.4) | 4.2 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 90.3 | (0.5) | 8.6 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
| Greece | 78.3 | (0.8) | 16.7 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 58.0 | (1.2) | 30.3 | (0.9) | 7.7 | (0.5) | 4.0 | (0.3) |
| Hungary | 93.2 | (0.5) | 5.5 | (0.5) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 90.8 | (0.6) | 7.7 | (0.4) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
| Iceland | 97.9 | (0.2) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 88.3 | (0.5) | 9.6 | (0.4) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
| Ireland | 96.0 | (0.3) | 3.3 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 87.6 | (0.8) | 9.9 | (0.6) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) |
| Israel | 69.5 | (0.7) | 25.0 | (0.7) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 68.8 | (1.1) | 23.5 | (0.8) | 4.5 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.3) |
| Italy | 51.8 | (0.5) | 41.3 | (0.5) | 4.6 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 65.5 | (0.5) | 29.0 | (0.4) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (0.1) |
| Japan | 98.5 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 97.1 | (0.5) | 2.3 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
| Korea | 98.2 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 97.1 | (0.4) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
| Luxembourg | 93.0 | (0.3) | 5.3 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 93.0 | (0.4) | 5.6 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.1) |
| Mexico | 79.1 | (0.5) | 18.7 | (0.4) | 1.6 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 78.2 | (0.4) | 18.9 | (0.4) | 2.2 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
| Netherlands | 97.3 | (0.2) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 89.0 | (0.7) | 9.5 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
| New Zealand | 82.9 | (0.6) | 12.9 | (0.5) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 84.7 | (0.7) | 11.8 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) |
| Norway | 92.9 | (0.4) | 5.9 | (0.4) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 88.2 | (0.5) | 9.7 | (0.5) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (0.2) |
| Poland | 84.1 | (0.8) | 13.3 | (0.8) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 79.6 | (0.9) | 16.4 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) |
| Portugal | 80.7 | (0.7) | 15.2 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 71.4 | (0.9) | 23.2 | (0.8) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.2) |
| Slovak Republic | 90.6 | (0.5) | 7.3 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 88.2 | (0.8) | 10.0 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
| Slovenia | 85.8 | (0.5) | 10.8 | (0.5) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 74.4 | (0.6) | 20.4 | (0.6) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.2) |
| Spain | 72.0 | (0.9) | 24.2 | (0.7) | 2.6 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 67.7 | (0.8) | 25.5 | (0.6) | 3.9 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.2) |
| Sweden | 92.8 | (0.4) | 5.8 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 79.5 | (0.8) | 16.1 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) |
| Switzerland | 95.0 | (0.3) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 89.4 | (0.6) | 9.0 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
| Turkey | 45.8 | (1.0) | 33.7 | (1.0) | 12.7 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.4) | 54.8 | (1.1) | 30.5 | (0.8) | 8.9 | (0.5) | 5.8 | (0.4) |
| United Kingdom | 82.1 | (0.6) | 15.2 | (0.5) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 88.0 | (0.5) | 9.5 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) |
| United States | 78.9 | (0.8) | 17.9 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 87.1 | (0.6) | 10.4 | (0.6) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
| OECD average | 85.5 | (0.1) | 11.6 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.0) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 82.2 | (0.1) | 14.2 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.0) | 1.3 | (0.0) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 85.3 | (0.6) | 12.0 | (0.6) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 80.6 | (0.6) | 16.6 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Argentina | 41.9 | (1.0) | 41.9 | (0.8) | 8.7 | (0.6) | 7.6 | (0.4) | 55.7 | (1.1) | 33.0 | (0.9) | 6.7 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) |
| ๔ | Brazil | 79.7 | (0.5) | 16.6 | (0.4) | 2.3 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 81.2 | (0.5) | 15.8 | (0.4) | 1.9 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Bulgaria | 74.8 | (1.2) | 18.0 | (0.8) | 3.9 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.4) | 66.2 | (1.2) | 24.7 | (0.8) | 5.3 | (0.5) | 3.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Colombia | 95.6 | (0.4) | 4.1 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 84.3 | (0.7) | 14.5 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Costa Rica | 68.5 | (1.0) | 25.1 | (0.9) | 4.0 | (0.4) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 57.0 | (1.4) | 33.5 | (1.1) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.4) |
|  | Croatia | 87.3 | (0.6) | 9.4 | (0.4) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 76.4 | (0.7) | 18.5 | (0.6) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 1.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 77.3 | (0.6) | 16.0 | (0.6) | 3.8 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.2) | 64.0 | (0.7) | 26.0 | (0.6) | 6.1 | (0.4) | 3.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 96.0 | (0.3) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.9 | (0.3) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 88.0 | (0.7) | 10.0 | (0.6) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 75.0 | (0.9) | 21.5 | (0.8) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Jordan | 56.6 | (0.9) | 36.6 | (0.8) | 4.6 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 70.3 | (0.9) | 23.8 | (0.8) | 3.8 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 80.3 | (0.9) | 17.2 | (0.8) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 82.5 | (0.8) | 15.2 | (0.7) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Latvia | 77.3 | (0.8) | 18.2 | (0.7) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 36.8 | (1.0) | 45.7 | (1.1) | 10.2 | (0.6) | 7.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 98.0 | (0.8) | 1.3 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 0.7 | (0.5) | 96.3 | (1.0) | 2.3 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.4) | 1.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Lithuania | 81.0 | (0.9) | 16.1 | (0.8) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 67.3 | (1.1) | 26.4 | (0.9) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 95.1 | (0.3) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 94.6 | (0.4) | 4.7 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 71.6 | (1.2) | 22.0 | (0.9) | 4.1 | (0.4) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 74.6 | (1.0) | 20.5 | (0.7) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.2) |
|  | Montenegro | 75.3 | (0.8) | 18.4 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 67.9 | (0.7) | 25.9 | (0.6) | 4.1 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Peru | 85.8 | (0.8) | 11.3 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 88.0 | (0.8) | 10.5 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Qatar | 83.6 | (0.4) | 12.7 | (0.4) | 2.4 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 79.7 | (0.4) | 15.9 | (0.3) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 65.7 | (1.1) | 25.9 | (0.8) | 4.7 | (0.4) | 3.6 | (0.4) | 55.8 | (1.3) | 34.1 | (1.0) | 6.1 | (0.4) | 4.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 78.7 | (0.7) | 15.7 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.2) | 69.6 | (1.1) | 23.4 | (0.8) | 4.5 | (0.4) | 2.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Serbia | 87.1 | (0.7) | 10.3 | (0.6) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 73.3 | (1.0) | 21.9 | (0.8) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 1.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 99.3 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 96.6 | (0.4) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Singapore | 85.5 | (0.4) | 12.5 | (0.4) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 87.5 | (0.5) | 10.6 | (0.5) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 95.7 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 90.7 | (0.6) | 7.1 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Thailand | 81.8 | (0.7) | 14.2 | (0.6) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.2) | 73.4 | (0.8) | 23.0 | (0.7) | 2.5 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Tunisia | 79.3 | (1.0) | 16.3 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 74.5 | (0.9) | 21.1 | (0.8) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.3) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 60.8 | (0.8) | 31.6 | (0.7) | 5.4 | (0.2) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 77.2 | (0.7) | 17.2 | (0.6) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 76.4 | (0.9) | 18.4 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (0.2) | 76.2 | (0.9) | 19.0 | (0.8) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Viet Nam | 90.8 | (0.8) | 7.9 | (0.6) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 93.4 | (0.5) | 5.6 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 큐푠 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
[Part 1/1]
Concentration of students skipping a day of school or some classes

|  |  | Percentage of students who are in schools where, in the two weeks prior to the PISA test... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Over 50\% of students skipped a day or a class at least once |  | More than $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ but $\mathbf{5 0} \%$ of students or fewer skipped a day or a class at least once |  | More than $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ but $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ of students or fewer skipped a day or a class at least once |  | $10 \%$ of students or fewer skipped a day or a class at least once |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 24.0 | (1.6) | 53.5 | (2.0) | 18.8 | (1.6) | 3.7 | (0.7) |
| O | Austria | 1.5 | (0.7) | 24.3 | (3.5) | 41.4 | (4.1) | 32.8 | (3.3) |
|  | Belgium | 1.2 | (0.4) | 9.1 | (1.6) | 29.3 | (2.5) | 60.4 | (2.3) |
|  | Canada | 15.3 | (1.8) | 60.0 | (2.4) | 23.2 | (1.6) | 1.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Chile | 2.2 | (1.0) | 32.1 | (2.9) | 36.5 | (3.7) | 29.2 | (3.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.1 | (0.6) | 9.0 | (1.8) | 35.3 | (3.5) | 54.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Denmark | 4.1 | (1.2) | 31.6 | (3.1) | 42.5 | (3.5) | 21.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Estonia | 18.5 | (2.4) | 55.2 | (2.6) | 23.0 | (1.9) | 3.3 | (1.1) |
|  | Finland | 0.3 | (0.2) | 31.2 | (3.2) | 54.5 | (3.4) | 14.0 | (2.1) |
|  | France | 4.2 | (1.2) | 31.6 | (3.1) | 38.7 | (3.8) | 25.6 | (3.0) |
|  | Germany | 0.5 | (0.4) | 10.4 | (2.1) | 45.2 | (3.2) | 43.9 | (3.1) |
|  | Greece | 45.9 | (4.2) | 43.2 | (4.1) | 10.0 | (1.8) | 0.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Hungary | 2.0 | (0.8) | 13.1 | (2.2) | 26.6 | (3.5) | 58.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Iceland | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (0.2) | 54.7 | (0.2) | 39.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (2.8) | 45.2 | (4.1) | 38.9 | (3.9) |
|  | Israel | 39.1 | (3.5) | 57.9 | (3.6) | 2.9 | (1.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Italy | 77.5 | (1.6) | 21.4 | (1.6) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Japan | 0.5 | (0.5) | 2.6 | (1.2) | 4.2 | (1.5) | 92.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Korea | 0.0 | c | 1.6 | (1.0) | 7.3 | (1.8) | 91.0 | (2.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.0 | c | 8.3 | (0.1) | 27.3 | (0.1) | 64.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 15.0 | (1.2) | 54.0 | (1.7) | 25.4 | (1.4) | 5.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.8 | (0.7) | 9.2 | (2.0) | 43.0 | (4.1) | 47.1 | (3.7) |
|  | New Zealand | 6.0 | (1.1) | 43.4 | (3.8) | 41.2 | (3.6) | 9.5 | (2.0) |
|  | Norway | 0.1 | (0.1) | 14.9 | (2.5) | 52.4 | (3.6) | 32.6 | (3.2) |
|  | Poland | 10.0 | (2.3) | 45.1 | (3.8) | 29.6 | (3.7) | 15.3 | (2.6) |
|  | Portugal | 14.6 | (3.2) | 67.4 | (4.2) | 16.5 | (3.2) | 1.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 3.1 | (1.1) | 18.4 | (2.7) | 42.6 | (3.7) | 35.9 | (3.5) |
|  | Slovenia | 12.8 | (0.4) | 47.5 | (0.8) | 30.4 | (0.6) | 9.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Spain | 37.7 | (2.8) | 50.9 | (2.9) | 9.7 | (1.4) | 1.8 | (0.3) |
|  | Sweden | 4.5 | (1.6) | 32.7 | (3.6) | 52.9 | (3.5) | 9.8 | (2.0) |
|  | Switzerland | 1.1 | (0.5) | 8.5 | (1.8) | 42.2 | (3.1) | 48.3 | (3.2) |
|  | Turkey | 86.3 | (2.6) | 12.8 | (2.4) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 3.3 | (1.0) | 41.3 | (3.2) | 48.8 | (3.3) | 6.7 | (1.8) |
|  | United States | 4.1 | (1.5) | 53.2 | (3.7) | 39.8 | (3.5) | 2.9 | (1.4) |
|  | OECD average | 12.9 | (0.3) | 29.9 | (0.5) | 30.7 | (0.5) | 26.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Albania | 2.3 | (1.0) | 47.8 | (3.7) | 44.5 | (3.9) | 5.3 | (1.3) |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | Argentina | 89.4 | (2.1) | 9.4 | (2.0) | 1.2 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c |
| \% | Brazil | 8.9 | (1.1) | 51.5 | (2.3) | 35.1 | (2.5) | 4.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 31.7 | (3.0) | 39.3 | (3.9) | 24.3 | (3.3) | 4.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Colombia | 1.3 | (0.7) | 23.3 | (3.5) | 51.4 | (4.1) | 24.0 | (3.5) |
|  | Costa Rica | 67.5 | (3.6) | 28.5 | (3.5) | 4.0 | (1.6) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Croatia | 12.1 | (1.8) | 41.1 | (3.3) | 39.1 | (3.4) | 7.7 | (2.1) |
|  | Cyprus* | 29.1 | (0.1) | 56.6 | (0.1) | 13.7 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | c | 0.2 | (0.0) | 19.0 | (3.0) | 80.7 | (3.0) |
|  | Indonesia | 8.7 | (2.0) | 51.1 | (4.0) | 35.7 | (3.7) | 4.4 | (1.3) |
|  | Jordan | 71.8 | (3.2) | 27.3 | (3.1) | 0.9 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Kazakhstan | 10.8 | (2.3) | 42.4 | (4.1) | 31.3 | (3.6) | 15.5 | (2.4) |
|  | Latvia | 87.7 | (2.4) | 11.0 | (2.4) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 19.2 | (1.1) | 80.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Lithuania | 23.4 | (3.1) | 52.8 | (3.5) | 18.9 | (2.9) | 4.9 | (1.4) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.9 | (0.0) | 3.2 | (0.0) | 31.2 | (0.1) | 64.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 33.9 | (3.8) | 53.6 | (4.1) | 10.1 | (2.2) | 2.4 | (1.3) |
|  | Montenegro | 20.4 | (0.1) | 65.6 | (0.2) | 13.8 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Peru | 1.9 | (0.8) | 29.6 | (3.1) | 48.3 | (3.6) | 20.2 | (3.0) |
|  | Qatar | 9.3 | (0.1) | 48.6 | (0.1) | 40.9 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) |
|  | Romania | 70.4 | (3.6) | 25.5 | (3.4) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 0.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 21.5 | (2.8) | 57.3 | (3.0) | 15.7 | (2.3) | 5.5 | (1.2) |
|  | Serbia | 9.9 | (2.2) | 50.2 | (3.9) | 31.0 | (3.8) | 8.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 5.8 | (1.8) | 94.2 | (1.8) |
|  | Singapore | 1.4 | (0.0) | 32.3 | (0.2) | 58.8 | (0.2) | 7.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 0.5 | (0.6) | 9.3 | (1.9) | 31.0 | (3.9) | 59.2 | (3.8) |
|  | Thailand | 16.3 | (2.0) | 48.9 | (3.4) | 29.4 | (3.0) | 5.4 | (1.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 13.9 | (3.0) | 59.6 | (4.3) | 24.4 | (3.6) | 2.1 | (1.3) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 52.8 | (2.3) | 41.0 | (2.4) | 6.1 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 12.4 | (2.3) | 64.6 | (3.1) | 18.1 | (2.3) | 4.9 | (1.4) |
|  | Viet Nam | 1.2 | (0.6) | 10.2 | (2.6) | 38.2 | (4.0) | 50.4 | (4.2) |

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Index of teacher－student relations and mathematics performance
Table IV．5．5 Results based on students＇self－reports


Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex
StatLink 唡正傦 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957517
[Part 2/2]
Index of teacher-student relations and mathematics performance
Table IV.5.5 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Explained } \\ \text { variance } \\ \text { in student } \\ \text { performance } \\ (r \text { r-squared } \times 100) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 471 | (2.6) | 506 | (2.8) | 513 | (3.3) | 527 | (3.0) | 21.8 | (1.3) | 1.74 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Austria | 503 | (4.3) | 514 | (4.1) | 513 | (4.6) | 503 | (4.2) | -0.9 | (1.5) | 1.06 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Belgium | 508 | (3.9) | 530 | (3.7) | 537 | (4.1) | 512 | (3.6) | 2.1 | (1.9) | 1.23 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Canada | 503 | (3.4) | 521 | (2.8) | 528 | (2.9) | 530 | (2.9) | 10.8 | (1.2) | 1.43 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Chile | 422 | (4.0) | 427 | (4.3) | 426 | (4.6) | 417 | (4.5) | -1.2 | (1.5) | 0.98 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 496 | (4.8) | 503 | (5.1) | 521 | (4.2) | 498 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (2.2) | 1.21 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Denmark | 480 | (3.5) | 505 | (3.9) | 516 | (3.8) | 520 | (4.1) | 16.3 | (2.0) | 1.60 | (0.1) | 3.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Estonia | 511 | (3.2) | 524 | (3.4) | 527 | (4.2) | 519 | (4.7) | 3.5 | (2.3) | 1.15 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Finland | 505 | (2.8) | 526 | (3.6) | 531 | (4.3) | 529 | (3.3) | 9.2 | (1.5) | 1.44 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.3) |
|  | France | 491 | (4.4) | 503 | (4.1) | 508 | (5.2) | 489 | (4.7) | -1.2 | (2.1) | 1.06 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Germany | 514 | (3.9) | 529 | (4.8) | 532 | (5.1) | 515 | (5.1) | -0.1 | (2.1) | 1.12 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Greece | 457 | (4.3) | 461 | (4.5) | 458 | (4.2) | 445 | (4.1) | -4.9 | (1.7) | 0.88 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.2) |
|  | Hungary | 473 | (6.1) | 481 | (5.2) | 486 | (4.9) | 472 | (4.9) | -2.2 | (2.7) | 1.03 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Iceland | 474 | (4.7) | 496 | (4.9) | 504 | (5.2) | 512 | (4.1) | 13.5 | (2.2) | 1.52 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Ireland | 488 | (3.9) | 505 | (4.3) | 507 | (4.0) | 504 | (4.1) | 6.2 | (1.9) | 1.32 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Israel | 473 | (5.7) | 481 | (6.9) | 478 | (6.6) | 463 | (7.6) | -4.1 | (2.3) | 0.94 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Italy | 494 | (2.8) | 497 | (3.1) | 488 | (3.0) | 469 | (2.9) | -9.1 | (1.3) | 0.84 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Japan | 520 | (5.2) | 543 | (4.6) | 544 | (5.1) | 542 | (4.3) | 8.4 | (2.0) | 1.39 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Korea | 538 | (5.7) | 552 | (5.0) | 546 | (6.1) | 580 | (7.7) | 16.4 | (3.0) | 1.28 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 484 | (3.2) | 494 | (4.2) | 500 | (3.8) | 482 | (3.2) | 0.4 | (1.5) | 1.12 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | 422 | (1.9) | 417 | (1.9) | 411 | (2.0) | 407 | (2.1) | -5.6 | (0.8) | 0.83 | (0.0) | 0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Netherlands | 512 | (4.3) | 530 | (5.3) | 544 | (5.2) | 526 | (6.6) | 5.7 | (2.9) | 1.31 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 475 | (4.1) | 501 | (5.0) | 511 | (5.4) | 511 | (4.3) | 13.9 | (2.4) | 1.43 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Norway | 465 | (5.5) | 496 | (4.3) | 504 | (5.2) | 498 | (5.1) | 13.2 | (2.4) | 1.56 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Poland | 517 | (5.6) | 524 | (4.7) | 526 | (6.0) | 508 | (5.6) | -4.4 | (2.0) | 1.00 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Portugal | 480 | (5.2) | 487 | (4.7) | 497 | (5.5) | 494 | (5.8) | 6.2 | (2.5) | 1.17 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 487 | (6.4) | 492 | (5.0) | 498 | (4.8) | 459 | (6.4) | -11.7 | (3.4) | 0.93 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Slovenia | 498 | (4.1) | 509 | (4.8) | 511 | (4.4) | 498 | (4.2) | -0.3 | (2.1) | 1.10 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.0) |
|  | Spain | 477 | (3.0) | 492 | (3.2) | 492 | (3.0) | 483 | (3.0) | 1.5 | (1.3) | 1.23 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Sweden | 465 | (3.8) | 484 | (4.1) | 489 | (5.0) | 492 | (4.4) | 9.9 | (2.1) | 1.30 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 521 | (4.3) | 541 | (4.3) | 538 | (5.0) | 527 | (4.7) | 1.7 | (1.6) | 1.12 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Turkey | 449 | (6.2) | 456 | (6.5) | 449 | (5.7) | 443 | (5.7) | -3.3 | (1.8) | 1.09 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | United Kingdom | 472 | (4.6) | 504 | (4.6) | 506 | (4.6) | 509 | (5.2) | 13.3 | (1.9) | 1.51 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.5) |
|  | United States | 466 | (4.1) | 479 | (4.9) | 492 | (6.4) | 499 | (5.1) | 13.9 | (1.9) | 1.41 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.6) |
|  | OECD average | 486 | (0.8) | 500 | (0.8) | 504 | (0.8) | 497 | (0.8) | 4.1 | (0.4) | 1.22 | (0.0) | 0.9 | (0.1) |


| 聯 | Albania | 395 | (4.6) | 392 | (5.0) | 397 | (4.9) | 391 | (4.5) | -1.0 | (2.0) | 0.97 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 401 | (4.6) | 395 | (4.6) | 390 | (4.5) | 374 | (5.2) | -9.6 | (1.7) | 0.78 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Brazil | 397 | (3.0) | 399 | (3.1) | 393 | (3.2) | 383 | (3.1) | -4.6 | (1.2) | 0.84 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Bulgaria | 456 | (4.5) | 440 | (5.4) | 445 | (5.1) | 424 | (5.9) | -10.3 | (2.0) | 0.68 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Colombia | 390 | (4.1) | 383 | (3.9) | 379 | (4.2) | 372 | (4.1) | -7.0 | (1.5) | 0.81 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Costa Rica | 415 | (4.5) | 413 | (4.2) | 406 | (4.4) | 393 | (4.1) | -7.2 | (1.4) | 0.80 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Croatia | 475 | (3.9) | 480 | (4.6) | 475 | (4.8) | 460 | (7.2) | -7.2 | (2.6) | 0.90 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Cyprus* | 432 | (3.3) | 446 | (3.5) | 452 | (3.9) | 445 | (3.1) | 5.5 | (1.6) | 1.15 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 553 | (5.1) | 565 | (4.5) | 570 | (5.5) | 567 | (4.9) | 4.1 | (2.6) | 1.16 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Indonesia | 372 | (5.7) | 372 | (4.4) | 378 | (4.7) | 380 | (4.7) | 2.7 | (1.8) | 1.13 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Jordan | 387 | (4.3) | 392 | (3.9) | 392 | (3.8) | 383 | (4.9) | -0.5 | (1.5) | 1.07 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 430 | (4.3) | 432 | (4.4) | 433 | (4.2) | 434 | (4.2) | 1.7 | (1.8) | 1.07 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Latvia | 485 | (4.5) | 496 | (4.8) | 496 | (4.8) | 484 | (4.6) | -1.6 | (2.7) | 1.06 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 555 | (13.7) | 536 | (17.6) | 533 | (18.6) | 526 | (16.2) | -5.6 | (6.5) | 0.59 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Lithuania | 469 | (3.9) | 480 | (4.4) | 479 | (5.0) | 485 | (4.8) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 1.15 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Macao-China | 533 | (2.9) | 542 | (4.8) | 538 | (4.4) | 546 | (3.6) | 4.0 | (1.8) | 1.12 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 423 | (4.8) | 428 | (4.7) | 422 | (4.0) | 414 | (4.0) | -3.3 | (1.8) | 1.10 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Montenegro | 431 | (3.9) | 420 | (3.9) | 410 | (3.6) | 386 | (3.2) | -15.5 | (1.5) | 0.66 | (0.1) | 4.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Peru | 379 | (5.8) | 378 | (4.5) | 373 | (4.6) | 364 | (5.0) | -6.2 | (1.8) | 0.91 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Qatar | 371 | (2.6) | 383 | (2.6) | 389 | (2.9) | 385 | (2.6) | 4.7 | (1.2) | 1.16 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 453 | (5.7) | 446 | (4.5) | 445 | (4.8) | 435 | (4.3) | -5.8 | (1.7) | 0.89 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 479 | (3.7) | 485 | (5.0) | 488 | (4.9) | 479 | (4.5) | -0.5 | (2.0) | 1.01 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Serbia | 457 | (4.2) | 459 | (5.2) | 452 | (4.9) | 429 | (5.3) | -10.4 | (2.0) | 0.79 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 585 | (5.1) | 613 | (4.9) | 618 | (5.2) | 635 | (5.2) | 16.9 | (2.2) | 1.53 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Singapore | 556 | (3.6) | 581 | (4.3) | 587 | (4.4) | 579 | (3.4) | 8.3 | (1.6) | 1.36 | (0.1) | 0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 554 | (4.8) | 563 | (5.7) | 555 | (5.8) | 567 | (4.5) | 3.9 | (1.9) | 0.98 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Thailand | 432 | (5.2) | 425 | (4.1) | 429 | (4.5) | 424 | (4.4) | -2.8 | (1.9) | 0.94 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Tunisia | 403 | (5.5) | 396 | (5.3) | 383 | (5.4) | 373 | (4.3) | -10.2 | (1.6) | 0.76 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.6) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 432 | (3.6) | 439 | (3.7) | 432 | (3.7) | 439 | (3.9) | 2.2 | (1.3) | 1.03 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 426 | (3.7) | 423 | (3.7) | 412 | (5.0) | 387 | (4.6) | -13.1 | (1.9) | 0.71 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | 530 | (5.3) | 508 | (6.6) | 507 | (6.0) | 501 | (6.0) | -10.7 | (2.0) | 0.58 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.5) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink (त्ता sh http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
[Part 1/2]
Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance
Table IV.5.6 Results based on students' self-reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 唡ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
[Part 2/2]
Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance
Table IV.5.6 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared $x$ 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 465 | (2.6) | 491 | (2.7) | 515 | (2.9) | 546 | (3.1) | 29.7 | (1.4) | 1.89 | (0.1) | 10.4 | (0.9) |
| نِّ | Austria | 487 | (5.4) | 502 | (4.2) | 513 | (4.8) | 531 | (4.9) | 14.6 | (2.3) | 1.53 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Belgium | 496 | (4.0) | 518 | (3.7) | 530 | (3.7) | 544 | (3.9) | 17.2 | (1.9) | 1.52 | (0.1) | 3.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Canada | 496 | (2.9) | 514 | (3.5) | 528 | (3.1) | 545 | (2.9) | 18.0 | (1.2) | 1.59 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Chile | 412 | (5.0) | 424 | (4.1) | 423 | (4.0) | 432 | (4.1) | 8.2 | (2.1) | 1.30 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 474 | (5.5) | 494 | (4.8) | 516 | (5.2) | 534 | (5.4) | 20.3 | (2.3) | 1.81 | (0.2) | 6.0 | (1.3) |
|  | Denmark | 489 | (3.7) | 500 | (4.1) | 507 | (4.2) | 524 | (3.4) | 13.8 | (2.0) | 1.40 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Estonia | 498 | (3.6) | 515 | (4.5) | 529 | (3.8) | 540 | (3.7) | 16.8 | (1.9) | 1.55 | (0.1) | 4.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Finland | 509 | (3.7) | 523 | (4.0) | 523 | (3.4) | 534 | (3.6) | 8.6 | (2.0) | 1.32 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.4) |
|  | France | 482 | (4.2) | 482 | (4.9) | 503 | (4.5) | 526 | (4.3) | 16.4 | (1.8) | 1.25 | (0.1) | 3.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Germany | 499 | (5.4) | 515 | (4.8) | 530 | (5.8) | 548 | (4.3) | 17.5 | (2.1) | 1.65 | (0.2) | 3.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | 430 | (4.1) | 446 | (4.5) | 459 | (3.8) | 486 | (3.9) | 21.6 | (2.0) | 1.75 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Hungary | 451 | (4.6) | 461 | (4.8) | 484 | (5.6) | 517 | (6.7) | 25.2 | (2.7) | 1.60 | (0.2) | 8.0 | (1.5) |
|  | Iceland | 481 | (4.8) | 496 | (5.0) | 501 | (4.8) | 507 | (4.3) | 12.4 | (2.6) | 1.32 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Ireland | 472 | (4.6) | 493 | (4.7) | 514 | (4.0) | 526 | (4.2) | 19.6 | (1.8) | 1.82 | (0.2) | 6.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Israel | 426 | (6.5) | 470 | (5.8) | 497 | (6.1) | 502 | (6.1) | 26.2 | (2.2) | 2.07 | (0.1) | 7.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Italy | 464 | (2.6) | 477 | (2.6) | 497 | (3.0) | 511 | (3.1) | 17.9 | (1.3) | 1.50 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 504 | (5.6) | 539 | (5.1) | 548 | (4.5) | 557 | (5.1) | 22.7 | (2.6) | 1.84 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Korea | 531 | (6.1) | 541 | (5.0) | 563 | (6.2) | 581 | (7.3) | 22.2 | (3.2) | 1.50 | (0.1) | 3.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 469 | (3.6) | 480 | (4.0) | 499 | (3.3) | 513 | (3.1) | 15.2 | (1.4) | 1.41 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Mexico | 401 | (2.1) | 411 | (1.6) | 417 | (1.8) | 428 | (2.0) | 11.3 | (1.0) | 1.41 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 507 | (5.5) | 529 | (5.6) | 534 | (5.5) | 548 | (5.6) | 15.5 | (2.9) | 1.44 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 463 | (3.6) | 486 | (4.9) | 507 | (4.7) | 543 | (4.8) | 29.8 | (2.3) | 1.80 | (0.2) | 9.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Norway | 470 | (4.7) | 490 | (4.3) | 497 | (4.9) | 507 | (4.8) | 15.5 | (2.2) | 1.44 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Poland | 502 | (5.2) | 513 | (4.3) | 525 | (5.3) | 534 | (6.7) | 11.8 | (2.3) | 1.35 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Portugal | 475 | (5.6) | 483 | (5.9) | 488 | (5.4) | 513 | (4.5) | 14.5 | (2.3) | 1.34 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 453 | (6.0) | 479 | (5.7) | 495 | (5.2) | 510 | (4.8) | 22.7 | (2.8) | 1.82 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Slovenia | 474 | (3.3) | 487 | (3.7) | 519 | (5.3) | 536 | (4.8) | 23.5 | (1.8) | 1.61 | (0.1) | 7.3 | (1.1) |
|  | Spain | 467 | (3.6) | 480 | (3.4) | 492 | (2.6) | 505 | (3.2) | 13.6 | (1.6) | 1.51 | (0.1) | 2.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Sweden | 464 | (4.0) | 483 | (4.5) | 484 | (4.3) | 497 | (4.1) | 11.5 | (2.3) | 1.37 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Switzerland | 512 | (4.4) | 528 | (4.0) | 539 | (4.5) | 546 | (5.0) | 12.6 | (2.2) | 1.40 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Turkey | 425 | (4.9) | 435 | (5.2) | 458 | (7.3) | 479 | (7.7) | 21.8 | (2.8) | 1.45 | (0.1) | 4.9 | (1.1) |
|  | United Kingdom | 466 | (4.2) | 485 | (4.6) | 513 | (4.7) | 526 | (5.1) | 23.0 | (1.9) | 1.80 | (0.1) | 6.9 | (1.1) |
|  | United States | 447 | (4.9) | 477 | (4.8) | 499 | (5.5) | 515 | (4.7) | 25.3 | (1.9) | 1.91 | (0.1) | 8.1 | (1.1) |
|  | OECD average | 472 | (0.8) | 490 | (0.8) | 504 | (0.8) | 520 | (0.8) | 18.1 | (0.4) | 1.57 | (0.0) | 4.2 | (0.2) |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { む } \\ & \text { § } \end{aligned}$ | Albania | 389 | (4.6) | 399 | (4.6) | 395 | (5.3) | 392 | (4.9) | 0.8 | (2.6) | 1.09 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Argentina | 380 | (4.9) | 386 | (4.9) | 393 | (4.5) | 403 | (5.2) | 9.2 | (2.5) | 1.35 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Brazil | 376 | (2.9) | 391 | (3.0) | 397 | (2.9) | 407 | (3.0) | 11.6 | (1.4) | 1.43 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Bulgaria | 407 | (5.6) | 438 | (5.1) | 452 | (5.5) | 469 | (6.0) | 25.8 | (3.1) | 1.92 | (0.2) | 6.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Colombia | 368 | (4.2) | 378 | (4.3) | 381 | (4.1) | 394 | (3.9) | 11.6 | (1.9) | 1.44 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Costa Rica | 400 | (3.4) | 406 | (3.8) | 404 | (5.9) | 416 | (5.2) | 7.1 | (2.6) | 1.09 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.6) |
|  | Croatia | 438 | (3.9) | 460 | (4.6) | 480 | (5.3) | 513 | (7.4) | 26.7 | (2.8) | 1.83 | (0.1) | 9.6 | (1.7) |
|  | Cyprus* | 423 | (3.4) | 438 | (3.4) | 450 | (3.3) | 465 | (3.4) | 15.3 | (1.9) | 1.58 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 542 | (5.7) | 559 | (4.4) | 575 | (4.4) | 578 | (4.5) | 14.1 | (2.3) | 1.49 | (0.1) | 2.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 360 | (5.9) | 386 | (4.9) | 387 | (5.5) | 369 | (4.1) | 3.8 | (2.1) | 1.54 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Jordan | 367 | (4.3) | 378 | (3.9) | 400 | (4.1) | 407 | (5.9) | 14.4 | (2.2) | 1.55 | (0.1) | 4.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 411 | (3.8) | 429 | (4.9) | 442 | (4.8) | 446 | (4.5) | 14.7 | (1.7) | 1.65 | (0.1) | 4.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Latvia | 478 | (4.6) | 485 | (4.8) | 494 | (5.5) | 503 | (5.3) | 10.6 | (2.1) | 1.41 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 520 | (14.1) | 536 | (18.5) | 536 | (15.0) | 554 | (15.4) | 14.4 | (6.7) | 1.14 | (0.4) | 2.4 | (2.2) |
|  | Lithuania | 445 | (3.8) | 471 | (5.1) | 491 | (4.0) | 506 | (4.5) | 21.1 | (2.0) | 1.99 | (0.1) | 6.3 | (1.1) |
|  | Macao-China | 524 | (3.3) | 533 | (3.5) | 544 | (3.2) | 559 | (3.1) | 16.2 | (2.1) | 1.38 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Malaysia | 388 | (4.7) | 415 | (4.5) | 432 | (4.1) | 452 | (4.6) | 29.4 | (2.1) | 2.06 | (0.2) | 9.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Montenegro | 390 | (3.5) | 406 | (3.2) | 420 | (3.7) | 428 | (4.2) | 13.3 | (1.7) | 1.54 | (0.1) | 2.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Peru | 359 | (5.2) | 369 | (5.5) | 376 | (4.7) | 382 | (4.7) | 11.1 | (2.7) | 1.50 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.5) |
|  | Qatar | 353 | (2.9) | 353 | (2.3) | 399 | (2.8) | 422 | (2.8) | 23.1 | (1.2) | 1.56 | (0.1) | 6.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Romania | 424 | (5.1) | 431 | (4.8) | 452 | (4.9) | 474 | (5.8) | 20.5 | (2.2) | 1.56 | (0.1) | 6.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 462 | (3.6) | 478 | (5.0) | 491 | (4.4) | 500 | (4.7) | 14.6 | (1.7) | 1.52 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Serbia | 422 | (5.6) | 444 | (4.4) | 457 | (5.6) | 475 | (5.6) | 19.7 | (2.3) | 1.65 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 572 | (5.4) | 598 | (5.8) | 631 | (4.5) | 649 | (4.4) | 33.4 | (2.5) | 1.96 | (0.1) | 9.9 | (1.2) |
|  | Singapore | 527 | (3.6) | 564 | (3.7) | 598 | (3.6) | 614 | (3.3) | 33.7 | (1.9) | 2.38 | (0.1) | 10.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 527 | (4.9) | 551 | (5.5) | 564 | (5.4) | 598 | (5.9) | 26.7 | (2.6) | 1.61 | (0.1) | 5.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Thailand | 404 | (4.6) | 425 | (4.7) | 441 | (4.3) | 440 | (4.7) | 17.6 | (2.2) | 1.60 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Tunisia | 382 | (4.4) | 383 | (5.0) | 391 | (5.3) | 400 | (5.1) | 6.4 | (1.9) | 1.13 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 402 | (3.2) | 432 | (3.6) | 451 | (4.3) | 458 | (4.6) | 19.7 | (1.8) | 1.85 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 386 | (3.8) | 405 | (4.7) | 422 | (5.1) | 435 | (4.2) | 19.0 | (2.2) | 1.64 | (0.1) | 4.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Viet Nam | 499 | (6.4) | 513 | (5.6) | 519 | (5.9) | 516 | (7.2) | 8.4 | (3.3) | 1.25 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.4) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Index of student-related factors affecting school climate and mathematics performance
Table IV.5.8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of student-related factors affecting school climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia | -0.18 | (0.04) | -1.39 | (0.04) | -0.51 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.04) | 1.14 | (0.08) | 1.02 | (0.03) |
| Austria | -0.30 | (0.08) | -1.49 | (0.13) | -0.60 | (0.07) | 0.07 | (0.10) | 0.83 | (0.11) | 0.95 | (0.06) |
| Belgium | -0.08 | (0.06) | -1.29 | (0.06) | -0.44 | (0.06) | 0.09 | (0.06) | 1.30 | (0.13) | 1.04 | (0.05) |
| Canada | -0.47 | (0.04) | -1.42 | (0.05) | -0.78 | (0.04) | -0.31 | (0.04) | 0.64 | (0.07) | 0.85 | (0.03) |
| Chile | 0.03 | (0.09) | -1.52 | (0.15) | -0.36 | (0.07) | 0.40 | (0.12) | 1.62 | (0.14) | 1.24 | (0.08) |
| Czech Republic | 0.20 | (0.06) | -0.96 | (0.08) | -0.17 | (0.08) | 0.47 | (0.09) | 1.49 | (0.10) | 0.96 | (0.05) |
| Denmark | 0.07 | (0.07) | -1.04 | (0.10) | -0.18 | (0.06) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 1.25 | (0.12) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
| Estonia | -0.05 | (0.05) | -1.12 | (0.05) | -0.38 | (0.06) | 0.18 | (0.07) | 1.10 | (0.08) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
| Finland | -0.50 | (0.04) | -1.30 | (0.05) | -0.74 | (0.05) | -0.29 | (0.08) | 0.33 | (0.05) | 0.65 | (0.03) |
| France | 0.01 | (0.06) | -1.16 | (0.08) | -0.32 | (0.05) | 0.15 | (0.08) | 1.40 | (0.11) | 1.01 | (0.05) |
| Germany | -0.18 | (0.04) | -1.03 | (0.07) | -0.40 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.05) | 0.72 | (0.07) | 0.69 | (0.03) |
| Greece | 0.03 | (0.08) | -1.37 | (0.16) | -0.16 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.07) | 1.26 | (0.10) | 1.05 | (0.07) |
| Hungary | 0.13 | (0.05) | -1.22 | (0.10) | -0.09 | (0.09) | 0.47 | (0.05) | 1.38 | (0.11) | 1.04 | (0.06) |
| Iceland | 0.31 | (0.01) | -0.63 | (0.01) | -0.08 | (0.01) | 0.48 | (0.01) | 1.49 | (0.01) | 0.86 | (0.00) |
| Ireland | -0.09 | (0.06) | -1.15 | (0.10) | -0.40 | (0.06) | 0.09 | (0.07) | 1.11 | (0.12) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
| Israel | -0.15 | (0.08) | -1.46 | (0.12) | -0.40 | (0.09) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 1.13 | (0.15) | 1.04 | (0.07) |
| Italy | 0.01 | (0.04) | -1.15 | (0.05) | -0.31 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.04) | 1.19 | (0.07) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
| Japan | 0.31 | (0.07) | -0.81 | (0.11) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 0.52 | (0.07) | 1.50 | (0.11) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| Korea | 0.07 | (0.09) | -1.32 | (0.13) | -0.27 | (0.09) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 1.53 | (0.18) | 1.13 | (0.07) |
| Luxembourg | -0.27 | (0.00) | -1.11 | (0.00) | -0.43 | (0.00) | -0.09 | (0.00) | 0.53 | (0.00) | 0.67 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 0.01 | (0.03) | -1.18 | (0.06) | -0.28 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.03) | 1.17 | (0.05) | 0.95 | (0.03) |
| Netherlands | -0.40 | (0.05) | -1.28 | (0.08) | -0.59 | (0.05) | -0.21 | (0.06) | 0.48 | (0.09) | 0.70 | (0.04) |
| New Zealand | -0.25 | (0.06) | -1.25 | (0.10) | -0.47 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.04) | 0.85 | (0.15) | 0.91 | (0.07) |
| Norway | -0.12 | (0.05) | -0.96 | (0.06) | -0.35 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.05) | 0.84 | (0.11) | 0.74 | (0.05) |
| Poland | 0.05 | (0.06) | -0.89 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.08) | 0.24 | (0.10) | 1.17 | (0.09) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| Portugal | -0.14 | (0.09) | -1.39 | (0.12) | -0.59 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.12) | 1.29 | (0.14) | 1.07 | (0.06) |
| Slovak Republic | -0.22 | (0.06) | -1.24 | (0.06) | -0.58 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.10) | 0.94 | (0.10) | 0.85 | (0.05) |
| Slovenia | -0.38 | (0.01) | -1.28 | (0.01) | -0.73 | (0.01) | -0.22 | (0.01) | 0.72 | (0.02) | 0.80 | (0.01) |
| Spain | 0.19 | (0.05) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.12 | (0.05) | 0.43 | (0.07) | 1.43 | (0.07) | 0.96 | (0.04) |
| Sweden | -0.19 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.07) | -0.44 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.03) | 0.85 | (0.11) | 0.81 | (0.05) |
| Switzerland | -0.04 | (0.06) | -0.96 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.06) | 0.89 | (0.10) | 0.76 | (0.05) |
| Turkey | -0.30 | (0.07) | -1.57 | (0.11) | -0.66 | (0.10) | 0.07 | (0.09) | 0.97 | (0.12) | 1.01 | (0.06) |
| United Kingdom | 0.40 | (0.06) | -0.53 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.47 | (0.08) | 1.65 | (0.12) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| United States | -0.14 | (0.08) | -1.22 | (0.08) | -0.46 | (0.10) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 1.16 | (0.16) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| OECD average | -0.08 | (0.01) | -1.17 | (0.01) | -0.38 | (0.01) | 0.14 | (0.01) | 1.10 | (0.02) | 0.91 | (0.01) |
| Albania | 0.91 | (0.07) | -0.23 | (0.11) | 0.63 | (0.08) | 1.14 | (0.09) | 2.11 | (0.11) | 0.93 | (0.05) |
| Argentina | 0.21 | (0.10) | -1.28 | (0.12) | -0.19 | (0.12) | 0.59 | (0.12) | 1.72 | (0.14) | 1.16 | (0.06) |
| ๕ Brazil | -0.49 | (0.06) | -1.88 | (0.08) | -0.92 | (0.07) | -0.23 | (0.07) | 1.08 | (0.11) | 1.17 | (0.05) |
| Bulgaria | 0.12 | (0.10) | -1.50 | (0.14) | -0.20 | (0.12) | 0.57 | (0.10) | 1.61 | (0.14) | 1.24 | (0.06) |
| Colombia | -0.59 | (0.06) | -1.82 | (0.09) | -0.94 | (0.06) | -0.39 | (0.09) | 0.77 | (0.12) | 1.03 | (0.06) |
| Costa Rica | -0.66 | (0.06) | -1.75 | (0.06) | -1.08 | (0.07) | -0.47 | (0.08) | 0.68 | (0.13) | 0.98 | (0.05) |
| Croatia | -0.53 | (0.07) | -1.70 | (0.07) | -0.87 | (0.09) | -0.27 | (0.09) | 0.73 | (0.14) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
| Cyprus* | -0.12 | (0.00) | -1.28 | (0.00) | -0.32 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.00) | 1.10 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.37 | (0.06) | -0.65 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.57 | (0.07) | 1.48 | (0.13) | 0.88 | (0.06) |
| Indonesia | 0.78 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.10) | 0.52 | (0.06) | 0.97 | (0.06) | 1.68 | (0.09) | 0.71 | (0.05) |
| Jordan | -0.12 | (0.10) | -1.92 | (0.15) | -0.54 | (0.12) | 0.34 | (0.10) | 1.63 | (0.17) | 1.38 | (0.08) |
| Kazakhstan | -0.61 | (0.13) | -2.54 | (0.12) | -1.54 | (0.19) | 0.02 | (0.23) | 1.64 | (0.12) | 1.66 | (0.06) |
| Latvia | -0.19 | (0.06) | -1.29 | (0.08) | -0.48 | (0.08) | 0.08 | (0.07) | 0.95 | (0.10) | 0.89 | (0.04) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.12 | (0.02) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.63 | (0.02) |
| Lithuania | 0.27 | (0.05) | -0.61 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.03) | 0.40 | (0.06) | 1.30 | (0.12) | 0.80 | (0.06) |
| Macao-China | 0.53 | (0.00) | -1.22 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.00) | 1.17 | (0.00) | 2.15 | (0.00) | 1.41 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.00 | (0.09) | -1.34 | (0.10) | -0.38 | (0.13) | 0.27 | (0.07) | 1.46 | (0.14) | 1.11 | (0.06) |
| Montenegro | -0.01 | (0.00) | -0.93 | (0.00) | -0.44 | (0.00) | 0.20 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.01) | 0.81 | (0.01) |
| Peru | 0.30 | (0.06) | -0.93 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.10) | 0.64 | (0.07) | 1.48 | (0.09) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Qatar | 0.53 | (0.00) | -0.80 | (0.00) | 0.24 | (0.00) | 0.69 | (0.00) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 1.15 | (0.00) |
| Romania | 0.60 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.10) | 0.33 | (0.09) | 0.85 | (0.06) | 1.77 | (0.13) | 0.93 | (0.05) |
| Russian Federation | -0.19 | (0.11) | -2.11 | (0.16) | -0.60 | (0.12) | 0.39 | (0.12) | 1.55 | (0.14) | 1.44 | (0.06) |
| Serbia | -0.50 | (0.06) | -1.48 | (0.07) | -0.82 | (0.06) | -0.29 | (0.10) | 0.58 | (0.10) | 0.81 | (0.05) |
| Shanghai-China | 0.26 | (0.13) | -2.19 | (0.11) | -0.44 | (0.25) | 1.13 | (0.21) | 2.54 | (0.10) | 1.82 | (0.07) |
| Singapore | 0.47 | (0.01) | -0.45 | (0.01) | 0.09 | (0.00) | 0.38 | (0.01) | 1.87 | (0.02) | 0.97 | (0.00) |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.72 | (0.11) | -0.99 | (0.18) | 0.26 | (0.12) | 1.14 | (0.16) | 2.47 | (0.11) | 1.35 | (0.07) |
| Thailand | 0.02 | (0.06) | -1.05 | (0.07) | -0.25 | (0.09) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 1.08 | (0.10) | 0.84 | (0.05) |
| Tunisia | -0.73 | (0.08) | -1.86 | (0.09) | -1.04 | (0.11) | -0.42 | (0.07) | 0.43 | (0.12) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.39 | (0.06) | -1.35 | (0.14) | 0.18 | (0.06) | 0.85 | (0.05) | 1.89 | (0.06) | 1.31 | (0.05) |
| Uruguay | 0.00 | (0.08) | -1.48 | (0.11) | -0.56 | (0.08) | 0.37 | (0.11) | 1.69 | (0.13) | 1.26 | (0.06) |
| Viet Nam | 0.03 | (0.06) | -0.82 | (0.08) | -0.21 | (0.07) | 0.23 | (0.07) | 0.93 | (0.08) | 0.69 | (0.04) |
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Table IV.5.10 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of teacher morale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 0.14 | (0.03) | -0.96 | (0.04) | -0.22 | (0.05) | 0.48 | (0.05) | 1.28 | (0.03) | 0.90 | (0.02) |
| Austria | 0.54 | (0.07) | -0.54 | (0.11) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 1.01 | (0.16) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.81 | (0.03) |
| Belgium | -0.27 | (0.06) | -1.27 | (0.09) | -0.74 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.11) | 0.93 | (0.10) | 0.90 | (0.03) |
| Canada | 0.18 | (0.04) | -1.02 | (0.05) | -0.21 | (0.09) | 0.59 | (0.04) | 1.36 | (0.05) | 0.95 | (0.02) |
| Chile | -0.31 | (0.08) | -1.49 | (0.15) | -0.74 | (0.11) | 0.13 | (0.12) | 0.88 | (0.09) | 0.98 | (0.06) |
| Czech Republic | -0.10 | (0.05) | -1.01 | (0.06) | -0.44 | (0.12) | 0.21 | (0.05) | 0.84 | (0.07) | 0.78 | (0.03) |
| Denmark | 0.40 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.04) | 0.07 | (0.14) | 0.94 | (0.11) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Estonia | 0.05 | (0.05) | -0.96 | (0.06) | -0.37 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.05) | 1.20 | (0.07) | 0.87 | (0.03) |
| Finland | 0.33 | (0.06) | -0.83 | (0.12) | 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.62 | (0.05) | 1.31 | (0.06) | 0.83 | (0.04) |
| France | -0.39 | (0.07) | -1.66 | (0.14) | -0.74 | (0.02) | 0.02 | (0.12) | 0.82 | (0.08) | 0.98 | (0.04) |
| Germany | 0.01 | (0.06) | -1.06 | (0.09) | -0.47 | (0.12) | 0.39 | (0.09) | 1.18 | (0.06) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Greece | -0.41 | (0.09) | -1.87 | (0.11) | -0.76 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.17) | 0.95 | (0.09) | 1.09 | (0.05) |
| Hungary | -0.02 | (0.07) | -1.15 | (0.08) | -0.35 | (0.12) | 0.38 | (0.07) | 1.07 | (0.08) | 0.90 | (0.03) |
| Iceland | 0.53 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.01) | 0.27 | (0.00) | 1.10 | (0.01) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.00) |
| Ireland | 0.49 | (0.08) | -0.90 | (0.08) | 0.25 | (0.17) | 1.18 | (0.12) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.96 | (0.05) |
| Israel | 0.17 | (0.07) | -1.17 | (0.12) | 0.11 | (0.16) | 0.56 | (0.06) | 1.19 | (0.07) | 0.95 | (0.06) |
| Italy | -0.60 | (0.03) | -1.80 | (0.03) | -0.81 | (0.05) | -0.34 | (0.07) | 0.56 | (0.05) | 0.92 | (0.02) |
| Japan | -0.49 | (0.07) | -1.60 | (0.10) | -0.74 | (0.03) | -0.49 | (0.15) | 0.88 | (0.09) | 0.94 | (0.04) |
| Korea | -0.32 | (0.09) | -1.59 | (0.12) | -0.74 | (0.00) | -0.05 | (0.19) | 1.12 | (0.12) | 1.06 | (0.04) |
| Luxembourg | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.85 | (0.00) | -0.41 | (0.00) | 0.35 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.00) | 0.76 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | -0.05 | (0.04) | -1.20 | (0.05) | -0.59 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.05) | 1.27 | (0.03) | 1.01 | (0.02) |
| Netherlands | -0.19 | (0.07) | -1.01 | (0.07) | -0.74 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.18) | 0.99 | (0.11) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| New Zealand | 0.36 | (0.06) | -0.88 | (0.05) | 0.04 | (0.14) | 0.81 | (0.12) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Norway | 0.26 | (0.06) | -0.91 | (0.06) | -0.10 | (0.14) | 0.61 | (0.09) | 1.43 | (0.06) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| Poland | -0.14 | (0.08) | -1.15 | (0.12) | -0.57 | (0.13) | 0.16 | (0.06) | 0.99 | (0.10) | 0.90 | (0.06) |
| Portugal | -0.17 | (0.08) | -1.42 | (0.13) | -0.51 | (0.13) | 0.24 | (0.06) | 1.01 | (0.10) | 0.98 | (0.05) |
| Slovak Republic | -0.27 | (0.06) | -1.28 | (0.12) | -0.68 | (0.10) | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.75 | (0.06) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| Slovenia | -0.18 | (0.01) | -1.22 | (0.02) | -0.63 | (0.03) | 0.24 | (0.01) | 0.90 | (0.01) | 0.89 | (0.01) |
| Spain | -0.43 | (0.05) | -1.70 | (0.08) | -0.74 | (0.06) | -0.12 | (0.06) | 0.86 | (0.09) | 0.98 | (0.03) |
| Sweden | 0.39 | (0.07) | -0.81 | (0.14) | 0.20 | (0.06) | 0.74 | (0.09) | 1.45 | (0.05) | 0.87 | (0.04) |
| Switzerland | 0.31 | (0.06) | -0.95 | (0.10) | 0.17 | (0.09) | 0.68 | (0.05) | 1.35 | (0.07) | 0.89 | (0.04) |
| Turkey | -0.23 | (0.08) | -1.50 | (0.15) | -0.74 | (0.03) | 0.20 | (0.17) | 1.12 | (0.10) | 1.06 | (0.05) |
| United Kingdom | 0.45 | (0.06) | -0.87 | (0.13) | 0.30 | (0.06) | 0.93 | (0.11) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| United States | -0.03 | (0.08) | -1.18 | (0.10) | -0.53 | (0.12) | 0.38 | (0.06) | 1.20 | (0.13) | 0.99 | (0.05) |
| OECD average | 0.00 | (0.01) | -1.16 | (0.02) | -0.34 | (0.02) | 0.38 | (0.02) | 1.13 | (0.01) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
| Albania | 0.35 | (0.07) | -0.70 | (0.13) | 0.16 | (0.07) | 0.60 | (0.06) | 1.34 | (0.07) | 0.78 | (0.04) |
| Argentina | -0.07 | (0.07) | -1.11 | (0.10) | -0.47 | (0.13) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 1.01 | (0.09) | 0.89 | (0.04) |
| ๕ Brazil | -0.50 | (0.05) | -1.91 | (0.07) | -0.75 | (0.05) | -0.25 | (0.08) | 0.90 | (0.09) | 1.07 | (0.04) |
| Bulgaria | 0.21 | (0.07) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.17) | 0.53 | (0.06) | 1.30 | (0.07) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| Colombia | 0.11 | (0.07) | -1.03 | (0.08) | -0.29 | (0.14) | 0.45 | (0.08) | 1.32 | (0.07) | 0.94 | (0.04) |
| Costa Rica | -0.02 | (0.07) | -1.23 | (0.10) | -0.53 | (0.11) | 0.43 | (0.10) | 1.25 | (0.07) | 1.02 | (0.04) |
| Croatia | -0.29 | (0.07) | -1.31 | (0.10) | -0.74 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.13) | 0.94 | (0.11) | 0.92 | (0.05) |
| Cyprus* | -0.07 | (0.00) | -1.18 | (0.00) | -0.63 | (0.00) | 0.25 | (0.00) | 1.28 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | -0.42 | (0.07) | -1.43 | (0.12) | -0.74 | (0.00) | -0.29 | (0.13) | 0.79 | (0.13) | 0.89 | (0.05) |
| Indonesia | 0.59 | (0.07) | -0.77 | (0.11) | 0.39 | (0.11) | 1.27 | (0.09) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Jordan | -0.21 | (0.08) | -1.51 | (0.11) | -0.73 | (0.09) | 0.25 | (0.14) | 1.14 | (0.11) | 1.08 | (0.05) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.51 | (0.07) | -0.65 | (0.16) | 0.33 | (0.07) | 0.92 | (0.15) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Latvia | 0.09 | (0.06) | -0.78 | (0.03) | -0.30 | (0.11) | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.16 | (0.08) | 0.78 | (0.03) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.08 | (0.01) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | 0.70 | (0.01) |
| Lithuania | 0.34 | (0.06) | -0.76 | (0.15) | 0.26 | (0.06) | 0.66 | (0.05) | 1.22 | (0.06) | 0.83 | (0.06) |
| Macao-China | -0.50 | (0.00) | -1.35 | (0.00) | -0.74 | (0.00) | -0.49 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.00) | 0.83 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.46 | (0.08) | -0.86 | (0.15) | 0.16 | (0.08) | 1.11 | (0.16) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.05) |
| Montenegro | 0.10 | (0.00) | -0.96 | (0.00) | -0.49 | (0.01) | 0.52 | (0.00) | 1.34 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.00) |
| Peru | -0.17 | (0.07) | -1.28 | (0.11) | -0.73 | (0.08) | 0.19 | (0.11) | 1.15 | (0.10) | 0.99 | (0.04) |
| Qatar | 0.77 | (0.00) | -0.54 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.00) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.00) |
| Romania | -0.04 | (0.07) | -1.16 | (0.10) | -0.27 | (0.13) | 0.31 | (0.06) | 0.94 | (0.10) | 0.87 | (0.05) |
| Russian Federation | -0.04 | (0.05) | -1.07 | (0.07) | -0.40 | (0.10) | 0.25 | (0.05) | 1.05 | (0.08) | 0.87 | (0.03) |
| Serbia | -0.37 | (0.08) | -1.47 | (0.14) | -0.74 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.15) | 0.70 | (0.09) | 0.87 | (0.05) |
| Shanghai-China | -0.01 | (0.07) | -1.07 | (0.09) | -0.53 | (0.13) | 0.33 | (0.10) | 1.24 | (0.06) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Singapore | 0.13 | (0.01) | -1.00 | (0.00) | -0.26 | (0.02) | 0.38 | (0.02) | 1.40 | (0.01) | 0.95 | (0.00) |
| Chinese Taipei | -0.14 | (0.08) | -1.06 | (0.09) | -0.74 | (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.19) | 1.25 | (0.12) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
| Thailand | 0.06 | (0.08) | -1.24 | (0.12) | -0.25 | (0.11) | 0.47 | (0.11) | 1.28 | (0.07) | 1.01 | (0.05) |
| Tunisia | -0.66 | (0.09) | -2.09 | (0.13) | -1.02 | (0.11) | -0.41 | (0.12) | 0.90 | (0.14) | 1.16 | (0.05) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.39 | (0.05) | -0.96 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.11) | 1.02 | (0.09) | 1.45 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.02) |
| Uruguay | -0.28 | (0.07) | -1.49 | (0.13) | -0.64 | (0.11) | 0.13 | (0.05) | 0.90 | (0.09) | 0.96 | (0.05) |
| Viet Nam | -0.30 | (0.06) | -1.15 | (0.10) | -0.74 | (0.00) | -0.16 | (0.11) | 0.84 | (0.11) | 0.85 | (0.05) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Index of teacher morale and mathematics performance
Table IV.5.10 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia | 490 | (3.1) | 496 | (2.7) | 511 | (3.8) | 520 | (3.9) | 14.3 | (1.7) | 1.30 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.4) |
| Austria | 497 | (8.3) | 518 | (9.2) | 499 | (9.5) | 509 | (7.7) | 3.3 | (6.5) | 1.10 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.4) |
| Belgium | 485 | (6.9) | 515 | (6.8) | 528 | (7.8) | 536 | (9.1) | 23.9 | (5.7) | 1.66 | (0.2) | 4.5 | (2.2) |
| Canada | 508 | (4.0) | 514 | (3.6) | 520 | (3.7) | 531 | (4.5) | 9.0 | (2.1) | 1.19 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.4) |
| Chile | 395 | (6.0) | 412 | (6.2) | 435 | (7.1) | 448 | (7.1) | 20.5 | (3.8) | 1.66 | (0.2) | 6.2 | (2.0) |
| Czech Republic | 498 | (7.4) | 495 | (7.9) | 501 | (7.5) | 506 | (8.0) | 4.9 | (5.4) | 1.00 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.4) |
| Denmark | 493 | (3.9) | 497 | (6.4) | 500 | (7.1) | 512 | (5.4) | 7.4 | (2.5) | 1.15 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.5) |
| Estonia | 512 | (3.7) | 512 | (4.5) | 526 | (4.5) | 531 | (4.4) | 10.1 | (2.3) | 1.18 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.5) |
| Finland | 518 | (3.7) | 515 | (4.7) | 520 | (4.0) | 522 | (4.4) | 2.4 | (2.2) | 1.00 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
| France | 478 | (9.3) | 477 | (8.5) | 500 | (10.6) | 532 | (8.2) | 19.6 | (4.8) | 1.31 | (0.2) | 3.9 | (1.8) |
| Germany | 489 | (7.5) | 516 | (9.5) | 526 | (8.6) | 522 | (9.2) | 14.9 | (4.8) | 1.41 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (1.4) |
| Greece | 439 | (6.5) | 451 | (7.2) | 461 | (7.4) | 461 | (7.7) | 8.5 | (3.6) | 1.35 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (1.0) |
| Hungary | 453 | (10.8) | 474 | (7.1) | 485 | (8.9) | 500 | (10.3) | 19.5 | (7.2) | 1.74 | (0.3) | 3.6 | (2.7) |
| Iceland | 487 | (4.0) | 496 | (3.6) | 491 | (5.1) | 499 | (3.6) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 1.17 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.2) |
| Ireland | 493 | (7.1) | 503 | (5.7) | 506 | (5.5) | 509 | (5.5) | 6.1 | (3.6) | 1.28 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.6) |
| Israel | 443 | (10.9) | 466 | (7.5) | 479 | (9.8) | 476 | (11.9) | 16.5 | (7.1) | 1.41 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (2.1) |
| Italy | 474 | (4.9) | 486 | (4.2) | 492 | (4.2) | 497 | (4.9) | 9.4 | (3.2) | 1.25 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.6) |
| Japan | 496 | (8.2) | 544 | (7.0) | 542 | (8.3) | 564 | (10.7) | 26.8 | (4.4) | 1.82 | (0.2) | 7.3 | (2.4) |
| Korea | 519 | (11.7) | 549 | (8.2) | 563 | (8.2) | 583 | (9.1) | 23.7 | (5.0) | 1.93 | (0.3) | 6.4 | (2.8) |
| Luxembourg | 469 | (2.8) | 488 | (2.4) | 503 | (2.7) | 500 | (2.4) | 21.0 | (1.4) | 1.38 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.4) |
| Mexico | 408 | (2.5) | 413 | (2.5) | 410 | (3.3) | 422 | (3.7) | 4.9 | (1.9) | 1.10 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.3) |
| Netherlands | 524 | (7.3) | 512 | (8.9) | 516 | (10.4) | 527 | (10.0) | 3.2 | (7.0) | 0.90 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.5) |
| New Zealand | 487 | (5.1) | 491 | (7.1) | 512 | (7.3) | 517 | (7.6) | 15.6 | (3.7) | 1.20 | (0.1) | 2.0 | (1.0) |
| Norway | 478 | (5.8) | 485 | (6.2) | 495 | (4.9) | 503 | (5.8) | 11.4 | (3.8) | 1.24 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Poland | 506 | (5.4) | 515 | (6.0) | 521 | (8.9) | 528 | (6.1) | 10.9 | (3.0) | 1.20 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.7) |
| Portugal | 471 | (8.5) | 483 | (7.0) | 487 | (8.2) | 505 | (7.5) | 13.3 | (4.2) | 1.29 | (0.2) | 1.9 | (1.2) |
| Slovak Republic | 480 | (8.2) | 486 | (8.4) | 479 | (8.6) | 481 | (10.5) | -0.2 | (6.6) | 0.99 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.3) |
| Slovenia | 500 | (3.9) | 495 | (4.1) | 506 | (3.9) | 513 | (4.9) | 5.7 | (1.8) | 0.99 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.2) |
| Spain | 467 | (4.5) | 478 | (4.4) | 492 | (4.1) | 500 | (4.9) | 12.1 | (2.6) | 1.39 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.8) |
| Sweden | 465 | (5.1) | 477 | (4.8) | 484 | (5.3) | 487 | (5.1) | 9.4 | (3.2) | 1.31 | (0.1) | 0.8 | (0.5) |
| Switzerland | 537 | (6.2) | 529 | (5.6) | 526 | (5.7) | 537 | (8.0) | -1.4 | (4.1) | 0.85 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
| Turkey | 427 | (8.1) | 429 | (6.4) | 456 | (10.1) | 481 | (13.5) | 20.5 | (4.9) | 1.31 | (0.2) | 5.7 | (2.7) |
| United Kingdom | 470 | (10.0) | 497 | (7.4) | 506 | (6.6) | 504 | (6.7) | 16.7 | (4.4) | 1.57 | (0.2) | 2.6 | (1.4) |
| United States | 465 | (6.9) | 472 | (6.5) | 492 | (5.7) | 500 | (9.4) | 14.4 | (4.9) | 1.49 | (0.2) | 2.5 | (1.6) |
| OECD average | 480 | (1.2) | 491 | (1.1) | 499 | (1.2) | 508 | (1.3) | 11.9 | (0.7) | 1.30 | (0.0) | 2.0 | (0.2) |


| $\cdots$ | Albania | 394 | (5.1) | 396 | (5.3) | 393 | (4.0) | 394 | (4.5) | -0.9 | (2.8) | 1.00 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{3}{5}$ | Argentina | 381 | (6.4) | 384 | (6.3) | 387 | (7.5) | 406 | (5.9) | 10.3 | (5.3) | 1.29 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (1.4) |
| ส | Brazil | 382 | (2.8) | 382 | (4.1) | 389 | (5.2) | 413 | (5.4) | 12.8 | (1.8) | 1.04 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Bulgaria | 413 | (8.3) | 434 | (8.6) | 452 | (10.1) | 456 | (10.2) | 20.0 | (5.5) | 1.47 | (0.2) | 3.5 | (2.0) |
|  | Colombia | 369 | (4.5) | 367 | (6.0) | 375 | (6.2) | 395 | (5.7) | 10.3 | (2.7) | 1.17 | (0.1) | 1.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Costa Rica | 395 | (5.6) | 401 | (5.6) | 409 | (8.0) | 423 | (7.3) | 10.9 | (3.4) | 1.31 | (0.2) | 2.6 | (1.8) |
|  | Croatia | 456 | (5.9) | 478 | (6.9) | 467 | (7.1) | 483 | (11.9) | 10.5 | (5.3) | 1.38 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Cyprus* | 424 | (2.5) | 432 | (4.1) | 450 | (2.9) | 451 | (2.3) | 12.1 | (1.1) | 1.26 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 535 | (7.5) | 564 | (7.9) | 563 | (8.7) | 583 | (9.8) | 21.2 | (5.0) | 1.58 | (0.2) | 3.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 361 | (8.8) | 368 | (8.4) | 384 | (7.6) | 387 | (6.0) | 11.9 | (4.5) | 1.32 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (1.7) |
|  | Jordan | 373 | (6.7) | 379 | (6.5) | 389 | (6.9) | 402 | (8.9) | 11.3 | (3.9) | 1.32 | (0.1) | 2.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 431 | (5.4) | 432 | (6.7) | 436 | (6.2) | 428 | (5.9) | -1.0 | (3.4) | 0.96 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Latvia | 490 | (5.5) | 487 | (5.0) | 485 | (6.4) | 493 | (6.9) | 0.6 | (4.4) | 0.94 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | -0.3 | (5.4) | 1.40 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Lithuania | 454 | (5.8) | 476 | (6.4) | 491 | (5.1) | 494 | (5.3) | 18.1 | (3.7) | 1.62 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 520 | (2.9) | 535 | (2.6) | 538 | (3.5) | 559 | (2.8) | 21.6 | (1.2) | 1.37 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Malaysia | 422 | (7.1) | 421 | (5.8) | 416 | (6.7) | 423 | (6.5) | 1.5 | (3.8) | 0.98 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Montenegro | 401 | (2.7) | 389 | (2.3) | 404 | (2.2) | 445 | (2.4) | 17.0 | (1.2) | 1.16 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Peru | 350 | (5.2) | 355 | (5.5) | 373 | (9.1) | 394 | (9.0) | 17.7 | (4.3) | 1.23 | (0.1) | 4.3 | (2.0) |
|  | Qatar | 369 | (1.4) | 374 | (1.8) | 381 | (2.6) | 382 | (2.4) | 6.1 | (0.8) | 1.04 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Romania | 429 | (6.6) | 443 | (5.9) | 451 | (7.4) | 455 | (8.2) | 13.1 | (4.9) | 1.32 | (0.2) | 2.0 | (1.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 462 | (4.2) | 480 | (5.9) | 490 | (5.8) | 496 | (7.0) | 17.2 | (3.1) | 1.41 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Serbia | 439 | (9.0) | 437 | (9.2) | 447 | (9.8) | 468 | (10.0) | 13.8 | (6.7) | 1.16 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (1.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 591 | (8.7) | 609 | (7.8) | 620 | (8.4) | 631 | (9.5) | 16.0 | (5.7) | 1.49 | (0.2) | 2.3 | (1.5) |
|  | Singapore | 553 | (2.9) | 565 | (4.1) | 579 | (4.0) | 602 | (2.8) | 21.0 | (1.4) | 1.21 | (0.1) | 3.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 540 | (7.1) | 545 | (8.8) | 569 | (10.5) | 586 | (13.5) | 21.1 | (6.7) | 1.30 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (2.1) |
|  | Thailand | 403 | (5.1) | 416 | (6.2) | 441 | (9.1) | 447 | (8.0) | 16.1 | (3.2) | 1.47 | (0.2) | 4.0 | (1.5) |
|  | Tunisia | 381 | (6.8) | 387 | (6.5) | 390 | (7.5) | 394 | (10.6) | 4.0 | (4.0) | 1.03 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.7) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 414 | (4.9) | 427 | (5.9) | 443 | (4.5) | 455 | (5.0) | 16.7 | (2.9) | 1.42 | (0.1) | 3.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Uruguay | 385 | (5.0) | 395 | (6.4) | 421 | (6.6) | 436 | (8.5) | 21.6 | (3.7) | 1.39 | (0.1) | 5.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Viet Nam | 503 | (7.0) | 508 | (8.4) | 506 | (9.4) | 529 | (9.5) | 9.6 | (5.9) | 1.17 | (0.2) | 0.9 | (1.1) |

[^40]Correlation between learning environment indicators at the school level
Table IV.5.11 Results based on students' and school principals' reports
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Table IV.5.11 Results based on students' and school principals' reports

|  | Correlation between: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School average index of teacher-student relations and... |  |  |  | School average index of disciplinary climate and... |  |  |  |  | Index of student-related factors affecting school climate and... |  |  |  | Index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate and... |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Corr. S.E. | Corr. S.E. | Corr. S.E. | Corr. S.E. | Corr. S.E. | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. | S.E. | Corr. | S.E. |
| - Australia | 0.39 (0.04) | 0.36 (0.03) | 0.19 (0.04) | 0.26 (0.03) | 0.34 (0.03) | 0.16 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.04) | 0.66 | (0.03) | 0.39 | (0.03) | 0.46 | (0.03) |
| Austria | 0.19 (0.08) | 0.13 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.07) | 0.21 (0.08) | 0.14 (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.08 | (0.08) | 0.48 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.06) |
| Belgium | 0.04 (0.07) | -0.09 (0.07) | -0.09 (0.07) | -0.17 $(0.06)$ | 0.21 (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.07) | 0.07 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.04) | 0.28 | (0.05) | 0.42 | (0.05) |
| Canada | 0.19 (0.05) | 0.23 (0.05) | 0.10 (0.06) | 0.12 (0.04) | 0.14 (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.04) | 0.15 | (0.05) | 0.47 | (0.04) | 0.27 | (0.04) | 0.42 | (0.05) |
| Chile | 0.22 (0.07) | 0.19 (0.08) | 0.19 (0.06) | 0.21 (0.08) | 0.16 (0.08) | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.75 | (0.03) | 0.47 | (0.06) | 0.56 | (0.06) |
| Czech Republic | 0.26 (0.06) | 0.21 (0.07) | 0.09 (0.07) | -0.02 (0.06) | 0.24 (0.07) | 0.11 | (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.06) | 0.59 | (0.05) | 0.35 | (0.06) | 0.44 | (0.05) |
| Denmark | 0.37 (0.05) | 0.17 (0.08) | 0.16 | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.31 (0.06) | 0.16 | (0.08) | 0.16 | (0.05) | 0.57 | (0.10) | 0.39 | (0.06) | 0.55 | (0.04) |
| Estonia | 0.13 (0.06) | 0.16 (0.06) | 0.14 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.06) | 0.10 (0.05) | 0.16 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.06) | 0.59 | (0.04) | 0.31 | (0.05) | 0.39 | (0.05) |
| Finland | 0.17 (0.06) | 0.17 (0.05) | 0.06 (0.06) | 0.05 (0.06) | 0.17 (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.06) | -0.09 | (0.07) | 0.45 | (0.05) | 0.22 | (0.06) | 0.45 | (0.05) |
| France | 0.00 (0.07) | -0.03 (0.08) | 0.02 (0.06) | 0.04 (0.07) | 0.34 (0.06) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.05) | 0.44 | (0.05) | 0.44 | (0.07) |
| Germany | 0.09 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.08) | 0.07 (0.06) | -0.01 (0.08) | 0.35 (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.06) | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.40 | (0.05) |
| Greece | 0.13 (0.08) | 0.17 (0.08) | 0.22 (0.07) | 0.04 (0.08) | 0.24 (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.08) | 0.71 | (0.04) | 0.40 | (0.08) | 0.39 | (0.07) |
| Hungary | 0.13 (0.08) | 0.06 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.06) | 0.10 (0.07) | 0.38 (0.08) | 0.15 | (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.06) | 0.36 | (0.06) | 0.47 | (0.06) |
| Iceland | 0.31 (0.01) | -0.03 (0.01) | -0.03 (0.01) | 0.09 (0.00) | 0.13 (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.23 | (0.01) | 0.69 | (0.00) | 0.23 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.00) |
| Ireland | 0.11 (0.07) | 0.25 (0.08) | 0.11 (0.07) | 0.19 (0.08) | 0.33 (0.08) | 0.22 | (0.08) | 0.04 | (0.08) | 0.55 | (0.07) | 0.36 | (0.07) | 0.47 | (0.05) |
| Israel | 0.05 (0.08) | -0.06 (0.08) | 0.07 (0.08) | 0.16 (0.07) | 0.15 (0.08) | 0.25 | (0.08) | 0.27 | (0.07) | 0.71 | (0.04) | 0.36 | (0.06) | 0.44 | (0.06) |
| Italy | 0.04 (0.04) | -0.02 (0.05) | 0.13 (0.05) | 0.03 (0.04) | 0.27 (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.08 | (0.04) | 0.46 | (0.04) | 0.33 | (0.04) | 0.32 | (0.04) |
| Japan | 0.33 (0.09) | 0.15 (0.08) | 0.20 (0.06) | 0.14 (0.08) | 0.42 (0.08) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.61 | (0.05) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.49 | (0.06) |
| Korea | 0.46 (0.09) | 0.34 (0.07) | 0.20 (0.07) | 0.17 (0.08) | 0.44 (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.07) | 0.38 | (0.08) | 0.65 | (0.06) | 0.51 | (0.07) | 0.39 | (0.10) |
| Luxembourg | 0.10 (0.00) | 0.35 (0.00) | 0.44 (0.00) | 0.03 (0.00) | 0.10 (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.00) | -0.12 | (0.00) | 0.69 | (0.00) | 0.51 | (0.00) | 0.50 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 0.15 (0.03) | 0.11 (0.04) | 0.11 (0.03) | 0.09 (0.03) | 0.14 (0.03) | 0.10 | (0.03) | 0.06 | (0.03) | 0.67 | (0.02) | 0.38 | (0.03) | 0.54 | (0.03) |
| Netherlands | 0.24 (0.08) | 0.07 (0.09) | 0.12 (0.08) | 0.09 (0.08) | 0.27 (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.09) | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.06) | 0.30 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.08) |
| New Zealand | 0.32 (0.07) | 0.24 (0.07) | 0.23 (0.07) | 0.16 (0.07) | 0.42 (0.06) | 0.26 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.06) | 0.61 | (0.07) | 0.30 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.07) |
| Norway | 0.28 (0.08) | 0.17 (0.06) | 0.13 (0.08) | 0.17 (0.06) | 0.20 (0.08) | 0.16 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.08) | 0.61 | (0.07) | 0.44 | (0.05) | 0.49 | (0.06) |
| Poland | 0.26 (0.07) | 0.13 (0.08) | 0.01 (0.07) | -0.02 (0.08) | 0.09 (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.08) | 0.63 | (0.05) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 0.46 | (0.07) |
| Portugal | 0.35 (0.06) | 0.16 (0.09) | 0.13 (0.09) | 0.10 (0.08) | 0.28 (0.08) | 0.23 | (0.08) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 0.58 | (0.06) | 0.31 | (0.08) | 0.42 | (0.07) |
| Slovak Republic | 0.04 (0.08) | -0.09 (0.08) | -0.10 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.08) | 0.25 (0.08) | -0.02 | (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.06) | 0.56 | (0.06) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 0.56 | (0.05) |
| Slovenia | 0.11 (0.03) | 0.17 (0.01) | 0.08 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.37 (0.01) | 0.27 | (0.01) | 0.15 | (0.01) | 0.53 | (0.01) | 0.23 | (0.01) | 0.40 | (0.01) |
| Spain | 0.20 (0.07) | 0.19 (0.04) | 0.23 (0.04) | 0.20 (0.05) | 0.26 (0.05) | 0.16 | (0.06) | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.60 | (0.03) | 0.37 | (0.05) | 0.45 | (0.05) |
| Sweden | 0.37 (0.05) | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.04 (0.06) | 0.13 (0.07) | 0.31 (0.06) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.06) | 0.67 | (0.05) | 0.40 | (0.06) | 0.54 | (0.04) |
| Switzerland | 0.32 (0.05) | 0.10 (0.06) | 0.10 (0.06) | 0.23 (0.06) | 0.18 (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.53 | (0.04) | 0.31 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.05) |
| Turkey | 0.15 (0.06) | 0.10 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.08) | 0.04 (0.09) | 0.36 (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.06) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.64 | (0.04) | 0.26 | (0.09) | 0.41 | (0.08) |
| United Kingdom | 0.35 (0.06) | 0.14 (0.06) | 0.19 (0.08) | 0.27 (0.06) | 0.18 (0.06) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.08 | (0.08) | 0.68 | (0.04) | 0.43 | (0.05) | 0.48 | (0.04) |
| United States | 0.42 (0.06) | 0.40 (0.07) | 0.36 (0.08) | 0.31 (0.09) | 0.44 (0.05) | 0.29 | (0.07) | 0.31 | (0.07) | 0.76 | (0.04) | 0.50 | (0.07) | 0.50 | (0.08) |
| OECD average | 0.21 (0.01) | 0.14 (0.01) | 0.12 (0.01) | 0.10 (0.01) | 0.26 (0.01) | 0.13 | (0.01) | 0.13 | (0.01) | 0.60 | (0.01) | 0.35 | (0.01) | 0.44 | (0.01) |
| $\cdots$ Albania | 0.24 (0.07) | -0.02 (0.07) | 0.06 (0.06) | 0.01 (0.06) | -0.01 (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.07) | -0.07 | (0.06) | 0.48 | (0.07) | 0.36 | (0.07) | 0.32 | (0.09) |
| § Argentina | 0.19 (0.07) | 0.04 (0.07) | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.15 (0.06) | 0.34 (0.08) | 0.28 | (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 0.55 | (0.05) | 0.44 | (0.07) | 0.52 | (0.06) |
| 玉 Brazil | 0.10 (0.05) | 0.15 (0.05) | 0.14 (0.05) | 0.16 (0.05) | 0.13 (0.06) | 0.10 | (0.06) | 0.13 | (0.05) | 0.70 | (0.03) | 0.34 | (0.05) | 0.51 | (0.05) |
| - Bulgaria | 0.04 (0.09) | -0.03 (0.08) | 0.00 (0.08) | -0.01 (0.07) | 0.26 (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.06) | 0.65 | (0.05) | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.34 | (0.07) |
| Colombia | 0.13 (0.07) | 0.08 (0.05) | 0.09 (0.06) | 0.01 (0.09) | 0.19 (0.09) | 0.08 | (0.08) | 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.65 | (0.06) | 0.40 | (0.06) | 0.39 | (0.06) |
| Costa Rica | 0.00 (0.07) | -0.10 (0.06) | -0.04 (0.06) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.19 (0.09) | 0.19 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.08) | 0.60 | (0.05) | 0.42 | (0.07) | 0.51 | (0.05) |
| Croatia | 0.01 (0.10) | 0.24 (0.06) | 0.18 (0.09) | 0.26 (0.07) | 0.28 (0.08) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.13 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.06) | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.41 | (0.08) |
| Cyprus* | 0.20 (0.01) | 0.39 (0.00) | 0.16 (0.00) | 0.12 (0.00) | 0.07 (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.12 | (0.00) | 0.70 | (0.00) | 0.30 | (0.00) | 0.34 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.23 (0.08) | 0.04 (0.09) | -0.03 (0.09) | -0.11 $(0.08)$ | 0.09 (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.10) | -0.03 | (0.08) | 0.63 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.07) | 0.56 | (0.07) |
| Indonesia | 0.05 (0.06) | 0.11 (0.06) | 0.01 (0.07) | 0.06 (0.07) | 0.11 (0.07) | 0.03 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.07) | 0.46 | (0.06) | 0.27 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.10) |
| Jordan | 0.11 (0.06) | 0.01 (0.08) | 0.02 (0.08) | 0.01 (0.08) | 0.19 (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.07) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.71 | (0.04) | 0.24 | (0.08) | 0.36 | (0.07) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.51 (0.06) | 0.06 (0.08) | 0.05 (0.08) | 0.06 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.08) | 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.17 | (0.08) | 0.18 | (0.09) |
| Latvia | 0.28 (0.06) | 0.18 (0.08) | 0.12 (0.06) | 0.08 (0.06) | 0.17 (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.07) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 0.56 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 0.41 | (0.07) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.25 (0.07) | -0.06 (0.03) | 0.24 (0.04) | 0.32 (0.06) | -0.33 (0.02) | -0.21 | (0.03) | -0.32 | (0.02) | 0.57 | (0.01) | 0.55 | (0.01) | 0.76 | (0.01) |
| Lithuania | 0.37 (0.05) | 0.16 (0.07) | 0.09 (0.06) | 0.17 (0.06) | 0.31 (0.05) | 0.14 | (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.07) | 0.46 | (0.06) | 0.31 | (0.07) | 0.41 | (0.08) |
| Macao-China | 0.14 (0.00) | 0.03 (0.00) | 0.03 (0.00) | 0.39 (0.00) | 0.40 (0.00) | 0.29 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.00) | 0.74 | (0.00) | 0.24 | (0.00) | 0.41 | (0.00) |
| Malaysia | 0.21 (0.08) | -0.15 (0.08) | 0.03 (0.08) | 0.12 (0.09) | 0.21 (0.09) | 0.15 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.63 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.06) | 0.38 | (0.07) |
| Montenegro | -0.06 (0.01) | -0.20 (0.01) | -0.19 (0.00) | -0.21 (0.00) | 0.08 (0.01) | 0.15 | (0.00) | 0.18 | (0.01) | 0.68 | (0.00) | 0.41 | (0.00) | 0.36 | (0.00) |
| Peru | 0.15 (0.07) | 0.04 (0.07) | 0.08 (0.06) | 0.09 (0.06) | 0.13 (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.07) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 0.62 | (0.05) | 0.42 | (0.07) | 0.41 | (0.08) |
| Qatar | 0.13 (0.00) | 0.26 (0.00) | 0.29 (0.00) | 0.35 (0.00) | 0.13 (0.00) | 0.10 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.00) | 0.75 | (0.00) | 0.32 | (0.00) | 0.34 | (0.00) |
| Romania | 0.22 (0.08) | -0.17 (0.06) | -0.06 (0.08) | -0.13 (0.07) | 0.17 (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.06) | 0.37 | (0.07) | 0.08 | (0.09) | 0.15 | (0.09) |
| Russian Federation | 0.25 (0.07) | -0.10 (0.07) | 0.03 (0.09) | 0.10 (0.07) | 0.06 (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.08) | 0.74 | (0.03) | 0.27 | (0.07) | 0.28 | (0.07) |
| Serbia | -0.13 (0.09) | -0.05 (0.07) | -0.04 (0.08) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.24 (0.07) | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.08) | 0.61 | (0.06) | 0.42 | (0.07) | 0.51 | (0.06) |
| Shanghai-China | 0.58 (0.04) | 0.15 (0.07) | 0.01 (0.08) | 0.20 (0.08) | 0.36 (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 0.24 | (0.06) | 0.80 | (0.03) | 0.30 | (0.07) | 0.30 | (0.07) |
| Singapore | 0.15 (0.01) | 0.13 (0.01) | 0.04 (0.00) | 0.15 (0.02) | 0.37 (0.00) | 0.15 | (0.00) | 0.21 | (0.01) | 0.74 | (0.00) | 0.30 | (0.01) | 0.30 | (0.00) |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.39 (0.06) | 0.07 (0.06) | 0.18 (0.06) | 0.05 (0.09) | 0.21 (0.08) | 0.13 | (0.08) | 0.30 | (0.07) | 0.69 | (0.05) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 0.25 | (0.09) |
| Thailand | 0.04 (0.08) | 0.00 (0.06) | 0.04 (0.06) | -0.03 (0.08) | 0.15 (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.57 | (0.05) | 0.39 | (0.07) | 0.51 | (0.05) |
| Tunisia | 0.08 (0.10) | -0.08 (0.08) | 0.07 (0.08) | -0.07 (0.07) | 0.06 (0.10) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.50 | (0.07) | 0.35 | (0.10) | 0.47 | (0.08) |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.19 (0.04) | -0.03 (0.04) | -0.08 (0.04) | -0.02 (0.04) | 0.20 (0.04) | 0.12 | (0.04) | 0.16 | (0.05) | 0.74 | (0.02) | 0.30 | (0.05) | 0.42 | (0.05) |
| Uruguay | 0.02 (0.06) | -0.19 (0.07) | -0.15 (0.07) | -0.15 (0.07) | 0.38 (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.06) | 0.23 | (0.06) | 0.64 | (0.05) | 0.32 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.04) |
| Viet Nam | 0.42 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.08) | 0.04 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.16 (0.08) | 0.03 | (0.09) | 0.04 | (0.07) | 0.54 | (0.06) | 0.41 | (0.07) | 0.33 | (0.07) |

[^42]［Part 1／1］
Correlation between learning environment indicators and school average socio－economic status at the school level

|  | Correlation between： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School average PISA index of economic，social and cultural status（ESCS）and．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of students who arrived late for school at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test （at the school level） |  | Percentage of students who skipped a day or a class at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test （at the school level） |  |  |  | School average index of disciplinary climate |  | Index of student－related factors affecting school climate |  | Index of teacher－related factors affecting school climate |  | Index of teacher morale |  |
|  | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． | Corr． | S．E． |
| Q Australia | －0．11 | （0．04） | －0．36 | （0．03） | 0.38 | （0．03） | 0.34 | （0．03） | 0.52 | （0．02） | 0.38 | （0．04） | 0.31 | （0．03） |
| Austria | 0.13 | （0．07） | 0.13 | （0．07） | －0．13 | （0．06） | 0.34 | （0．07） | 0.23 | （0．07） | 0.16 | （0．08） | 0.09 | （0．08） |
| －Belgium | －0．34 | （0．06） | －0．41 | （0．05） | －0．06 | （0．06） | 0.35 | （0．06） | 0.56 | （0．04） | 0.30 | （0．05） | 0.30 | （0．05） |
| Canada | －0．09 | （0．06） | －0．14 | （0．06） | 0.13 | （0．05） | 0.13 | （0．04） | 0.36 | （0．05） | 0.21 | （0．06） | 0.17 | （0．05） |
| Chile | －0．30 | （0．05） | －0．27 | （0．06） | －0．10 | （0．06） | 0.19 | （0．06） | 0.45 | （0．05） | 0.33 | （0．06） | 0.33 | （0．06） |
| Czech Republic | －0．28 | （0．06） | －0．18 | （0．07） | －0．07 | （0．06） | 0.25 | （0．06） | 0.31 | （0．06） | 0.12 | （0．06） | 0.14 | （0．07） |
| Denmark | －0．03 | （0．07） | －0．15 | （0．06） | 0.21 | （0．06） | 0.31 | （0．06） | 0.35 | （0．05） | 0.22 | （0．06） | 0.25 | （0．05） |
| Estonia | 0.09 | （0．05） | －0．01 | （0．06） | 0.03 | （0．07） | －0．03 | （0．05） | 0.09 | （0．05） | 0.04 | （0．05） | 0.10 | （0．04） |
| Finland | 0.16 | （0．05） | －0．06 | （0．06） | 0.10 | （0．06） | 0.06 | （0．07） | 0.01 | （0．06） | 0.04 | （0．05） | 0.15 | （0．06） |
| France | －0．29 | （0．06） | －0．28 | （0．05） | －0．20 | （0．08） | 0.39 | （0．04） | 0.34 | （0．05） | 0.24 | （0．08） | 0.29 | （0．06） |
| Germany | 0.03 | （0．08） | －0．15 | （0．07） | －0．20 | （0．06） | 0.22 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．06） | 0.12 | （0．07） | 0.19 | （0．07） |
| Greece | 0.16 | （0．09） | －0．13 | （0．06） | －0．22 | （0．05） | 0.39 | （0．06） | 0.14 | （0．05） | 0.15 | （0．05） | 0.22 | （0．09） |
| Hungary | －0．39 | （0．08） | －0．60 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．08） | 0.50 | （0．06） | 0.47 | （0．06） | 0.22 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．09） |
| Iceland | 0.03 | （0．01） | －0．21 | （0．01） | 0.28 | （0．01） | 0.03 | （0．01） | －0．01 | （0．01） | 0.01 | （0．01） | 0.25 | （0．01） |
| Ireland | －0．28 | （0．07） | －0．04 | （0．07） | －0．05 | （0．08） | 0.28 | （0．06） | 0.42 | （0．06） | 0.27 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．09） |
| Israel | －0．09 | （0．07） | 0.18 | （0．06） | －0．16 | （0．08） | 0.22 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．07） | 0.03 | （0．08） | 0.17 | （0．08） |
| Italy | －0．28 | （0．04） | －0．34 | （0．03） | －0．23 | （0．05） | 0.34 | （0．04） | 0.41 | （0．04） | 0.03 | （0．05） | 0.18 | （0．04） |
| Japan | －0．24 | （0．08） | －0．43 | （0．06） | 0.30 | （0．07） | 0.47 | （0．07） | 0.34 | （0．08） | 0.26 | （0．07） | 0.38 | （0．06） |
| Korea | －0．33 | （0．07） | －0．31 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．08） | 0.36 | （0．07） | 0.25 | （0．07） | 0.06 | （0．09） | 0.32 | （0．07） |
| Luxembourg | －0．02 | （0．00） | －0．35 | （0．00） | －0．18 | （0．00） | 0.16 | （0．00） | 0.47 | （0．00） | 0.13 | （0．00） | 0.34 | （0．00） |
| Mexico | 0.17 | （0．04） | 0.25 | （0．03） | －0．15 | （0．04） | 0.04 | （0．04） | 0.12 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.14 | （0．04） |
| Netherlands | －0．23 | （0．06） | 0.04 | （0．08） | 0.01 | （0．09） | 0.18 | （0．08） | 0.21 | （0．07） | －0．06 | （0．09） | －0．01 | （0．09） |
| New Zealand | －0．37 | （0．07） | －0．59 | （0．05） | 0.18 | （0．06） | 0.43 | （0．07） | 0.53 | （0．05） | 0.30 | （0．07） | 0.27 | （0．07） |
| Norway | 0.10 | （0．07） | 0.06 | （0．06） | 0.08 | （0．08） | 0.00 | （0．07） | 0.28 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．07） |
| Poland | 0.43 | （0．05） | 0.17 | （0．06） | －0．22 | （0．08） | －0．09 | （0．08） | 0.04 | （0．09） | 0.07 | （0．08） | 0.19 | （0．07） |
| Portugal | －0．02 | （0．07） | －0．20 | （0．08） | 0.00 | （0．08） | 0.01 | （0．09） | 0.17 | （0．09） | 0.13 | （0．10） | 0.17 | （0．09） |
| Slovak Republic | －0．20 | （0．08） | －0．37 | （0．05） | －0．36 | （0．07） | 0.36 | （0．06） | 0.25 | （0．05） | 0.05 | （0．07） | 0.01 | （0．08） |
| Slovenia | －0．16 | （0．03） | －0．38 | （0．03） | －0．14 | （0．03） | 0.52 | （0．02） | 0.27 | （0．01） | 0.25 | （0．01） | 0.06 | （0．01） |
| Spain | －0．11 | （0．06） | －0．27 | （0．04） | －0．05 | （0．04） | 0.20 | （0．04） | 0.45 | （0．04） | 0.27 | （0．04） | 0.33 | （0．06） |
| Sweden | －0．01 | （0．08） | －0．16 | （0．07） | 0.11 | （0．07） | 0.32 | （0．07） | 0.43 | （0．06） | 0.33 | （0．06） | 0.30 | （0．06） |
| Switzerland | 0.32 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．05） | －0．02 | （0．06） | 0.03 | （0．07） | 0.08 | （0．07） | 0.09 | （0．07） | －0．07 | （0．06） |
| Turkey | －0．22 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．07） | －0．12 | （0．08） | 0.36 | （0．06） | 0.31 | （0．07） | 0.34 | （0．08） | 0.36 | （0．08） |
| United Kingdom | －0．19 | （0．05） | －0．16 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.20 | （0．09） | 0.35 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．08） | 0.25 | （0．07） |
| United States | －0．47 | （0．06） | －0．46 | （0．06） | 0.32 | （0．09） | 0.44 | （0．05） | 0.42 | （0．06） | 0.35 | （0．07） | 0.26 | （0．09） |
| OECD average | －0．10 | （0．01） | －0．17 | （0．01） | －0．01 | （0．01） | 0.24 | （0．01） | 0.30 | （0．01） | 0.18 | （0．01） | 0.21 | （0．01） |


| $\sim$ | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{5}$ | Argentina | －0．25 | （0．08） | －0．20 | （0．10） | －0．48 | （0．06） | 0.03 | （0．09） | 0.33 | （0．08） | 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.13 | （0．08） |
| む | Brazil | 0.10 | （0．05） | －0．03 | （0．06） | －0．06 | （0．05） | 0.12 | （0．05） | 0.38 | （0．04） | 0.31 | （0．05） | 0.32 | （0．05） |
|  | Bulgaria | －0．32 | （0．07） | －0．44 | （0．05） | －0．38 | （0．06） | 0.34 | （0．09） | 0.23 | （0．06） | 0.10 | （0．08） | 0.18 | （0．07） |
|  | Colombia | －0．03 | （0．07） | 0.06 | （0．06） | －0．19 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．06） | 0.25 | （0．06） | 0.21 | （0．07） | 0.26 | （0．06） |
|  | Costa Rica | －0．02 | （0．08） | －0．23 | （0．08） | －0．36 | （0．06） | 0.07 | （0．10） | 0.43 | （0．07） | 0.19 | （0．08） | 0.19 | （0．08） |
|  | Croatia | 0.03 | （0．06） | －0．39 | （0．05） | －0．25 | （0．10） | 0.49 | （0．05） | 0.20 | （0．08） | 0.17 | （0．08） | 0.16 | （0．08） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | －0．19 | （0．00） | －0．05 | （0．00） | 0.23 | （0．01） | 0.21 | （0．00） | 0.15 | （0．00） | 0.19 | （0．00） | 0.18 | （0．00） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | －0．22 | （0．07） | －0．11 | （0．08） | －0．14 | （0．09） | 0.08 | （0．09） | 0.21 | （0．09） | 0.25 | （0．09） | 0.26 | （0．08） |
|  | Indonesia | 0.11 | （0．10） | 0.06 | （0．07） | 0.13 | （0．06） | －0．24 | （0．07） | 0.17 | （0．08） | 0.09 | （0．08） | 0.24 | （0．05） |
|  | Jordan | 0.09 | （0．07） | －0．03 | （0．07） | －0．02 | （0．08） | 0.01 | （0．09） | 0.06 | （0．08） | 0.15 | （0．08） | 0.19 | （0．07） |
|  | Kazakhstan | －0．14 | （0．09） | －0．25 | （0．07） | 0.01 | （0．08） | 0.22 | （0．08） | －0．04 | （0．07） | －0．02 | （0．07） | 0.09 | （0．07） |
|  | Latvia | 0.01 | （0．08） | 0.03 | （0．07） | －0．32 | （0．06） | －0．04 | （0．07） | 0.01 | （0．08） | －0．03 | （0．08） | －0．03 | （0．08） |
|  | Liechtenstein | －0．35 | （0．02） | 0.10 | （0．03） | －0．08 | （0．02） | 0.08 | （0．02） | 0.45 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．02） | 0.41 | （0．02） |
|  | Lithuania | －0．02 | （0．06） | －0．22 | （0．07） | 0.08 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．06） | 0.21 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．06） |
|  | Macao－China | －0．02 | （0．00） | 0.14 | （0．00） | 0.16 | （0．00） | 0.13 | （0．00） | 0.26 | （0．00） | 0.35 | （0．00） | 0.34 | （0．00） |
|  | Malaysia | －0．31 | （0．07） | 0.09 | （0．09） | －0．26 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．08） | 0.41 | （0．06） | 0.25 | （0．09） | 0.10 | （0．09） |
|  | Montenegro | －0．16 | （0．01） | －0．11 | （0．01） | －0．80 | （0．00） | 0.23 | （0．01） | 0.20 | （0．01） | 0.28 | （0．00） | 0.30 | （0．01） |
|  | Peru | －0．14 | （0．08） | －0．43 | （0．06） | －0．17 | （0．07） | 0.07 | （0．08） | 0.29 | （0．06） | 0.14 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．07） |
|  | Qatar | 0.05 | （0．00） | 0.23 | （0．00） | －0．15 | （0．00） | 0.29 | （0．00） | －0．02 | （0．00） | 0.02 | （0．00） | －0．05 | （0．00） |
|  | Romania | －0．14 | （0．08） | －0．26 | （0．08） | －0．30 | （0．06） | 0.39 | （0．06） | 0.27 | （0．06） | 0.12 | （0．08） | 0.19 | （0．07） |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.04 | （0．07） | －0．01 | （0．07） | －0．20 | （0．06） | 0.08 | （0．07） | 0.21 | （0．09） | 0.04 | （0．08） | 0.30 | （0．07） |
|  | Serbia | 0.02 | （0．08） | －0．20 | （0．11） | －0．38 | （0．06） | 0.38 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．10） | 0.19 | （0．09） |
|  | Shanghai－China | －0．29 | （0．07） | －0．10 | （0．08） | 0.47 | （0．05） | 0.41 | （0．06） | 0.17 | （0．07） | 0.02 | （0．09） | 0.20 | （0．07） |
|  | Singapore | －0．32 | （0．01） | －0．15 | （0．00） | 0.10 | （0．01） | 0.46 | （0．01） | 0.47 | （0．01） | 0.25 | （0．01） | 0.18 | （0．02） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | －0．22 | （0．08） | －0．53 | （0．05） | 0.12 | （0．08） | 0.54 | （0．07） | 0.36 | （0．07） | 0.22 | （0．06） | 0.28 | （0．09） |
|  | Thailand | －0．05 | （0．05） | －0．10 | （0．06） | －0．14 | （0．06） | －0．09 | （0．06） | 0.12 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．05） |
|  | Tunisia | 0.17 | （0．07） | －0．10 | （0．07） | －0．41 | （0．08） | －0．29 | （0．09） | －0．08 | （0．08） | －0．14 | （0．09） | 0.03 | （0．09） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 0.04 | （0．04） | －0．26 | （0．05） | －0．20 | （0．04） | 0.31 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．04） | 0.20 | （0．04） | 0.09 | （0．05） |
|  | Uruguay | －0．13 | （0．08） | －0．43 | （0．05） | －0．48 | （0．07） | 0.27 | （0．07） | 0.54 | （0．05） | 0.51 | （0．06） | 0.34 | （0．06） |
|  | Viet Nam | －0．24 | （0．06） | －0．38 | （0．05） | －0．27 | （0．07） | －0．19 | （0．09） | 0.20 | （0．08） | －0．06 | （0．09） | 0.11 | （0．07） |

Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
StatLink 京两结 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957517
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Relationship between disciplinary climate and school features
Table IV.5.13 Results based on students' and school principals' reports

|  | Regression model estimating the average index of disciplinary climate at the school level ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inter |  | School average PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) (1 unit increase) |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { School size } \\ \text { (per } 100 \text { students) }\end{array}$ |  | School size (per 100 students) (squared) |  | School in a small town or village ( 15000 or less people) |  | School in a city or a large city ( 100000 or more people) |  | Private school |  |
|  | Intercept | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. |
| Q Australia | -0.21 | (0.13) | 0.25 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.04) | 0.13 | (0.05) |
| U Austria | 0.15 | (0.28) | 0.29 | (0.10) | 0.04 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.17 | (0.09) | -0.01 | (0.10) | -0.02 | (0.17) |
| - Belgium | -0.01 | (0.25) | 0.24 | (0.07) | 0.02 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.06) | -0.03 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.06) |
| Canada | -0.18 | (0.17) | 0.04 | (0.05) | -0.04 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.06 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.04) | 0.10 | (0.06) |
| Chile | -0.12 | (0.24) | 0.10 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.08) | 0.03 | (0.06) |
| Czech Republic | 0.42 | (0.29) | 0.46 | (0.14) | -0.03 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.09 | (0.10) | -0.20 | (0.10) | -0.15 | (0.16) |
| Denmark | -0.72 | (0.26) | 0.31 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.10 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.06) | 0.31 | (0.10) |
| Estonia | 0.40 | (0.26) | 0.06 | (0.10) | -0.06 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.09 | (0.07) | -0.06 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.19) |
| Finland | -0.45 | (0.25) | 0.21 | (0.09) | -0.08 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.06) | -0.08 | (0.04) | 0.28 | (0.08) |
| France | -0.20 | (0.25) | 0.41 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.06) | -0.03 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.09) |
| Germany | -0.24 | (0.26) | 0.18 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.12) |
| Greece | -0.34 | (0.21) | 0.23 | (0.08) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.08) | 0.02 | (0.06) |  | c |
| Hungary | 0.44 | (0.21) | 0.39 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.09) | -0.05 | (0.09) | -0.02 | (0.13) |
| Iceland | 0.00 | (0.06) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.02 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.11 | (0.01) | 0.12 | (0.01) | c | c |
| Ireland | 0.09 | (0.32) | 0.30 | (0.09) | -0.07 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.13 | (0.09) | -0.13 | (0.11) | 0.16 | (0.07) |
| Israel | 0.51 | (0.34) | 0.10 | (0.14) | 0.01 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.08 | (0.09) | 0.08 | (0.07) | c | c |
| Italy | -0.03 | (0.17) | 0.31 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.05) | -0.10 | (0.05) | -0.13 | (0.10) |
| Japan | 1.16 | (0.27) | 0.66 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | c | c | -0.06 | (0.07) | -0.24 | (0.08) |
| Korea | 0.53 | (0.30) | 0.37 | (0.09) | -0.10 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.47 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.08) | 0.16 | (0.06) |
| Luxembourg | 0.10 | (0.01) | -0.05 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.00) | c | c | 0.13 | (0.00) |
| Mexico | 0.28 | (0.10) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.04) | -0.10 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.06) |
| Netherlands | -0.12 | (0.26) | 0.11 | (0.11) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.11 | (0.09) | -0.19 | (0.06) | -0.07 | (0.05) |
| New Zealand | -0.17 | (0.29) | 0.35 | (0.09) | -0.01 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.23) |
| Norway | 0.33 | (0.29) | -0.04 | (0.12) | -0.07 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.06 | (0.08) | 0.12 | (0.08) | c | c |
| Poland | -0.12 | (0.39) | 0.05 | (0.15) | -0.12 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.17 | (0.12) | -0.07 | (0.13) | -0.14 | (0.21) |
| Portugal | 0.01 | (0.26) | 0.00 | (0.06) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.07) | -0.16 | (0.07) | 0.31 | (0.11) |
| Slovak Republic | 0.00 | (0.19) | 0.40 | (0.08) | -0.07 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.14 | (0.07) | -0.15 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.12) |
| Slovenia | -0.14 | (0.18) | 0.54 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.07 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.10 | (0.03) |
| Spain | -0.23 | (0.18) | 0.11 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.18 | (0.07) |
| Sweden | -0.08 | (0.19) | 0.27 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.03 | (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.07) |
| Switzerland | 0.50 | (0.16) | 0.02 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.05) | -0.16 | (0.07) | -0.09 | (0.13) |
| Turkey | 0.03 | (0.21) | 0.19 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.18 | (0.10) | -0.07 | (0.06) | c | c |
| United Kingdom | 0.44 | (0.25) | 0.15 | (0.13) | -0.06 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.10 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.08) |
| United States | 0.19 | (0.31) | 0.28 | (0.06) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.10 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.15) |
| OECD average | 0.06 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.01) | -0.02 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.01) | 0.07 | (0.02) |
| Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| F Argentina | -1.10 | (0.22) | -0.01 | (0.08) | -0.06 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.15 | (0.09) | 0.05 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.09) |
| ๕ Brazil | -0.52 | (0.19) | 0.03 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.05) | -0.04 | (0.04) | 0.20 | (0.08) |
| Bulgaria | 0.08 | (0.20) | 0.07 | (0.07) | 0.08 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.08) | -0.17 | (0.06) | c | c |
| Colombia | 0.24 | (0.22) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.03 | (0.08) | -0.08 | (0.07) | 0.15 | (0.08) |
| Costa Rica | -0.06 | (0.26) | -0.11 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.08) | 0.50 | (0.19) |
| Croatia | 0.66 | (0.27) | 0.66 | (0.09) | 0.13 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.08) | -0.29 | (0.09) | c | c |
| Cyprus* | -0.59 | (0.03) | 0.20 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.00) | -0.11 | (0.00) | 0.05 | (0.00) |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.17 | (0.33) | -0.07 | (0.05) | 0.05 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | 0.12 | (0.11) |
| Indonesia | 0.52 | (0.27) | -0.08 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.07) | -0.10 | (0.06) |
| Jordan | 0.12 | (0.24) | -0.23 | (0.10) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.15) |
| Kazakhstan | 0.89 | (0.32) | 0.38 | (0.10) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.13) | -0.08 | (0.12) | -0.16 | (0.14) |
| Latvia | 0.21 | (0.28) | 0.09 | (0.11) | -0.08 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.16 | (0.14) | -0.14 | (0.11) | c | c |
| Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Lithuania | 0.24 | (0.30) | 0.36 | (0.10) | -0.04 | (0.05) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.11) | -0.01 | (0.09) | c | c |
| Macao-China | 2.32 | (0.01) | 0.21 | (0.00) | 0.03 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | c | , | c | c | c | c |
| Malaysia | 0.02 | (0.25) | 0.15 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.16) |
| Montenegro | -0.78 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.01) | -0.06 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.00) | -0.23 | (0.00) | c | c |
| Peru | 0.18 | (0.21) | 0.03 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.07) | -0.03 | (0.06) | -0.11 | (0.08) |
| Qatar | -0.33 | (0.01) | 0.05 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.05 | (0.00) | -0.13 | (0.00) | 0.45 | (0.00) |
| Romania | -0.03 | (0.26) | 0.47 | (0.06) | -0.03 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.13 | (0.08) | -0.16 | (0.08) | c | c |
| Russian Federation | 0.56 | (0.25) | 0.30 | (0.11) | -0.06 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.25 | (0.10) | 0.07 | (0.06) | c | c |
| Serbia | -0.39 | (0.36) | 0.32 | (0.12) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.08 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.08) | c | c |
| Shanghai-China | 0.40 | (0.32) | 0.39 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | 0.01 | (0.12) |
| Singapore | 0.74 | (0.02) | 0.34 | (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.40 | (0.30) | 0.46 | (0.09) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.02 | (0.12) | -0.03 | (0.07) | -0.05 | (0.07) |
| Thailand | -0.03 | (0.18) | 0.01 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.14 | (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.05) | -0.07 | (0.06) |
| Tunisia | -0.15 | (0.30) | -0.05 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.07 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.05) | c | c |
| United Arab Emirates | -0.10 | (0.22) | 0.15 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.09) |
| Uruguay | -0.03 | (0.27) | 0.15 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.09) | -0.07 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.20) |
| Viet Nam | 0.24 | (0.25) | 0.00 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.08) | -0.15 | (0.10) | -0.08 | (0.08) |

[^43][Part 2/2]
Relationship between disciplinary climate and school features
Table IV.5.13 Results based on students' and school principals' reports

|  |  | Regression model estimating the average index of disciplinary climate at the school level ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variance accounted for by this model |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | School receives pressure from parents to achieve high academic standards |  | Index of quality of physical infrastructure (1 unit increase) |  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources <br> (1 unit increase) |  | Index of teacher shortage (1 unit increase) |  | ```Socio-economic heterogeneity of school intake (standard deviation of ESCS within school)``` |  | Academic heterogeneity of school intake (standard deviation of mathematics performance within school) |  |  |  |
|  |  | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | -0.01 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.06 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 15.0 | (3.0) |
| U | Austria | -0.10 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.05) | -0.11 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 18.4 | (7.2) |
|  | Belgium | -0.05 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.03) | -0.03 | (0.03) | -0.03 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 20.3 | (5.6) |
|  | Canada | 0.04 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.10 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 8.9 | (2.8) |
|  | Chile | -0.01 | (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.13 | (0.17) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 8.7 | (5.1) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.02 | (0.12) | 0.03 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.07) | -0.07 | (0.07) | -0.38 | (0.27) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 11.2 | (5.0) |
|  | Denmark | -0.03 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.04) | 0.38 | (0.25) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 25.9 | (6.1) |
|  | Estonia | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.03) | 0.09 | (0.03) | -0.07 | (0.04) | -0.22 | (0.27) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 6.1 | (4.1) |
|  | Finland | 0.02 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.03) | -0.03 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.19) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 7.7 | (3.8) |
|  | France | -0.03 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.03) | -0.07 | (0.04) | -0.34 | (0.23) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 21.7 | (6.0) |
|  | Germany | -0.03 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.04) | 0.03 | (0.04) | -0.05 | (0.04) | 0.26 | (0.23) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 9.4 | (5.2) |
|  | Greece | 0.06 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.24 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 20.7 | (6.3) |
|  | Hungary | 0.28 | (0.09) | 0.04 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.22) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 32.9 | (6.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.25 | (0.01) | 0.04 | (0.01) | -0.03 | (0.01) | -0.04 | (0.00) | -0.28 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 13.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Ireland | -0.02 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.04) | 0.05 | (0.05) | 0.05 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.28) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 18.8 | (6.5) |
|  | Israel | -0.02 | (0.09) | 0.00 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.03) | -0.32 | (0.25) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 10.6 | (5.5) |
|  | Italy | 0.09 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.10 | (0.15) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 18.5 | (2.5) |
|  | Japan | 0.11 | (0.05) | 0.07 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.03 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.32) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 39.3 | (5.5) |
|  | Korea | 0.00 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.05) | 0.01 | (0.04) | -0.45 | (0.32) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 36.8 | (7.7) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.12 | (0.00) | -0.07 | (0.00) | 0.09 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.00) | -0.83 | (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 35.0 | (0.2) |
|  | Mexico | -0.03 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.02) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.16 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 2.9 | (1.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.13 | (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.04) | -0.17 | (0.29) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 15.5 | (6.1) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.12 | (0.09) | 0.01 | (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.03) | -0.15 | (0.20) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 26.3 | (8.6) |
|  | Norway | -0.03 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.10 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.04) | -0.49 | (0.20) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 16.0 | (5.6) |
|  | Poland | 0.00 | (0.09) | -0.03 | (0.06) | -0.01 | (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.18) | 0.06 | (0.34) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 7.8 | (5.3) |
|  | Portugal | -0.03 | (0.07) | 0.02 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.03) | -0.06 | (0.20) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 18.9 | (5.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.01 | (0.08) | -0.02 | (0.03) | -0.03 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.04) | -0.28 | (0.19) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 21.3 | (5.7) |
|  | Slovenia | -0.05 | (0.02) | 0.02 | (0.01) | 0.03 | (0.01) | 0.05 | (0.02) | -0.11 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 31.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Spain | -0.06 | (0.05) | -0.07 | (0.02) | 0.09 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.02) | -0.08 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 9.5 | (3.1) |
|  | Sweden | -0.06 | (0.11) | -0.02 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.03) | -0.10 | (0.21) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 12.9 | (6.2) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.06 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.03 | (0.03) | -0.35 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 9.3 | (4.6) |
|  | Turkey | -0.01 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.32 | (0.15) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 29.9 | (6.3) |
|  | United Kingdom | 0.04 | (0.11) | 0.02 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.04) | -0.42 | (0.29) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 10.8 | (5.7) |
|  | United States | -0.03 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 24.9 | (6.5) |
|  | OECD average | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.01) | -0.02 | (0.01) | -0.12 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 18.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | Argentina | 0.14 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.03) | 0.03 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.18) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 13.8 | (6.5) |
| む | Brazil | 0.08 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.03) | -0.01 | (0.02) | 0.03 | (0.13) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 7.0 | (3.0) |
|  | Bulgaria | 0.10 | (0.05) | -0.05 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.04) | -0.11 | (0.05) | -0.39 | (0.17) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 27.5 | (7.4) |
|  | Colombia | -0.04 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.02) | -0.22 | (0.17) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 9.2 | (4.5) |
|  | Costa Rica | -0.07 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.03) | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.03) | 0.06 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 13.2 | (6.5) |
|  | Croatia | -0.06 | (0.07) | 0.03 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.02 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.35) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 34.4 | (6.7) |
|  | Cyprus* | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.01 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.57 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 14.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.04 | (0.04) | -0.04 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.03) | -0.55 | (0.23) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 16.2 | (5.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.04 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.03) | 0.05 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.04) | -0.31 | (0.13) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 13.8 | (6.5) |
|  | Jordan | 0.02 | (0.07) | -0.07 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.05) | -0.07 | (0.03) | -0.59 | (0.26) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 20.3 | (8.5) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 0.07 | (0.06) | 0.03 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.04) | 0.05 | (0.03) | 0.16 | (0.33) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 17.8 | (6.8) |
|  | Latvia | -0.06 | (0.08) | 0.01 | (0.06) | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.04 | (0.06) | -0.23 | (0.25) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 9.8 | (4.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
|  | Lithuania | 0.05 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.09 | (0.05) | -0.04 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 10.2 | (3.9) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.10 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | -0.05 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.00) | -1.20 | (0.00) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 45.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Malaysia | 0.09 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.03) | 0.04 | (0.03) | 0.11 | (0.04) | 0.23 | (0.15) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 27.5 | (7.9) |
|  | Montenegro | 0.14 | (0.00) | -0.02 | (0.00) | 0.04 | (0.00) | -0.04 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.00) | 40.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Peru | -0.09 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.02) | 0.03 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.02) | -0.11 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 6.4 | (4.5) |
|  | Qatar | 0.20 | (0.00) | -0.03 | (0.00) | -0.02 | (0.00) | -0.03 | (0.00) | -0.28 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 39.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Romania | 0.10 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.05) | 0.08 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.21) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 26.7 | (6.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.02 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.04) | -0.30 | (0.25) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 14.1 | (4.8) |
|  | Serbia | 0.01 | (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.03 | (0.05) | 0.75 | (0.37) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 19.7 | (7.7) |
|  | Shanghai-China | -0.12 | (0.10) | 0.04 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.03) | 0.55 | (0.31) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 33.7 | (7.1) |
|  | Singapore | 0.12 | (0.01) | 0.01 | (0.00) | 0.06 | (0.00) | -0.02 | (0.00) | -0.25 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 27.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | -0.02 | (0.13) | 0.00 | (0.05) | -0.01 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.34) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 39.1 | (8.6) |
|  | Thailand | 0.10 | (0.07) | -0.04 | (0.02) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.02) | -0.06 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 15.0 | (5.3) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.01 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.03) | 0.02 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 13.9 | (8.1) |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 0.01 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.03) | 0.03 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | -0.24 | (0.19) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 19.6 | (4.3) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.08 | (0.05) | 0.03 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.03) | -0.04 | (0.03) | 0.44 | (0.20) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 17.8 | (4.7) |
|  | Viet Nam | -0.01 | (0.08) | 0.03 | (0.02) | -0.01 | (0.03) | 0.01 | (0.02) | 0.15 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 15.0 | (7.7) |

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

1. Regression: School average disciplinary climate $=$ Intercept + variables listed in this table

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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Probability of having skipped a class or a day of school, by students having arrived late for school Table IV.5.14 Results based on students' self-reports
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Students arriving late for school and student gender and immigrant backgrounds
Table IV.5.15 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Increased likelihood that: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Boys reported having arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |  | Students with an immigrant background reported having arrived late at least once in the two weeks prior to the PISA test |  |
|  |  | Ratio | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 0.95 | (0.03) | 1.04 | (0.04) |
| 0 | Austria | 0.98 | (0.07) | 1.93 | (0.16) |
|  | Belgium | 1.08 | (0.04) | 1.65 | (0.09) |
|  | Canada | 1.04 | (0.02) | 1.18 | (0.04) |
|  | Chile | 0.96 | (0.03) | 1.29 | (0.12) |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.22 | (0.07) | 1.28 | (0.19) |
|  | Denmark | 1.19 | (0.05) | 1.36 | (0.06) |
|  | Estonia | 1.20 | (0.05) | 1.31 | (0.07) |
|  | Finland | 1.16 | (0.03) | 1.43 | (0.06) |
|  | France | 1.08 | (0.04) | 1.55 | (0.10) |
|  | Germany | 1.03 | (0.06) | 1.57 | (0.13) |
|  | Greece | 0.99 | (0.03) | 0.99 | (0.05) |
|  | Hungary | 1.10 | (0.08) | 0.93 | (0.27) |
|  | Iceland | 1.25 | (0.06) | 1.23 | (0.14) |
|  | Ireland | 1.20 | (0.08) | 1.14 | (0.10) |
|  | Israel | 0.95 | (0.03) | 1.06 | (0.05) |
|  | Italy | 1.10 | (0.03) | 1.12 | (0.06) |
|  | Japan | 1.40 | (0.13) | c | c |
|  | Korea | 1.06 | (0.07) | c | c |
|  | Luxembourg | 1.03 | (0.04) | 1.37 | (0.06) |
|  | Mexico | 1.00 | (0.02) | 1.04 | (0.08) |
|  | Netherlands | 1.06 | (0.06) | 1.39 | (0.13) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.94 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
|  | Norway | 1.07 | (0.05) | 1.30 | (0.08) |
|  | Poland | 1.27 | (0.05) | c | c |
|  | Portugal | 0.97 | (0.03) | 1.18 | (0.06) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 1.19 | (0.07) | 0.79 | (0.30) |
|  | Slovenia | 0.98 | (0.04) | 1.19 | (0.08) |
|  | Spain | 0.96 | (0.02) | 1.53 | (0.06) |
|  | Sweden | 1.10 | (0.03) | 1.28 | (0.04) |
|  | Switzerland | 1.01 | (0.05) | 1.40 | (0.09) |
|  | Turkey | 1.20 | (0.04) | 1.14 | (0.18) |
|  | United Kingdom | 1.02 | (0.04) | 1.23 | (0.08) |
|  | United States | 1.06 | (0.05) | 1.27 | (0.09) |
|  | OECD average | 1.08 | (0.01) | 1.26 | (0.02) |
|  | Albania | 1.03 | (0.04) | c | c |
| $\stackrel{\text { ar }}{ }$ | Argentina | 0.97 | (0.04) | 1.25 | (0.07) |
| ๕ | Brazil | 1.01 | (0.03) | 1.67 | (0.23) |
|  | Bulgaria | 1.03 | (0.03) | c | c |
|  | Colombia | 1.06 | (0.04) | c | c |
|  | Costa Rica | 0.97 | (0.03) | 0.96 | (0.07) |
|  | Croatia | 1.25 | (0.05) | 1.17 | (0.07) |
|  | Cyprus* | 1.09 | (0.03) | 1.03 | (0.06) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 1.15 | (0.08) | 0.95 | (0.08) |
|  | Indonesia | 1.23 | (0.07) | c | c |
|  | Jordan | 1.24 | (0.06) | 1.01 | (0.06) |
|  | Kazakhstan | 1.21 | (0.06) | 1.00 | (0.07) |
|  | Latvia | 1.13 | (0.04) | 0.96 | (0.07) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 1.44 | (0.37) | 1.60 | (0.38) |
|  | Lithuania | 1.31 | (0.05) | 1.36 | (0.14) |
|  | Macao-China | 1.12 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
|  | Malaysia | 1.20 | (0.06) | 1.38 | (0.18) |
|  | Montenegro | 1.13 | (0.04) | 1.10 | (0.09) |
|  | Peru | 1.03 | (0.03) | c | c |
|  | Qatar | 1.11 | (0.03) | 0.55 | (0.01) |
|  | Romania | 1.13 | (0.04) | c | c |
|  | Russian Federation | 1.13 | (0.03) | 1.12 | (0.07) |
|  | Serbia | 1.20 | (0.05) | 0.99 | (0.08) |
|  | Shanghai-China | 1.27 | (0.09) | 1.30 | (0.41) |
|  | Singapore | 1.18 | (0.06) | 0.85 | (0.06) |
|  | Chinese Taipei | 1.28 | (0.08) | c | c |
|  | Thailand | 1.40 | (0.05) | 0.68 | (0.23) |
|  | Tunisia | 1.09 | (0.04) | c | c |
|  | United Arab Emirates | 1.19 | (0.06) | 0.61 | (0.03) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.95 | (0.03) | c | c |
|  | Viet Nam | 1.26 | (0.08) | c | c |

[^45]［Part 1／2］
Relationship between student having arrived late for school and student and school features

|  |  | Logistic regression model estimating student having arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Intercept |  | PISA index of economic，social and cultural status （ESCS） （1 unit increase） |  | Student is a female |  | Student＇s language at home is the same as the language of assessment |  | Student without an immigrant background |  | School average PISA index of economic，social and cultural status （1 unit increase） |  | School size （per 100 students） |  |
|  |  | Intercept | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． | Logistic regression coef． | S．E． |
| $\bigcirc$ | Australia | －0．85 | （0．10） | －0．13 | （0．03） | 0.09 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．08） | 0.02 | （0．08） | 0.06 | （0．09） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
| 4 | Austria | －0．42 | （0．23） | 0.16 | （0．07） | －0．11 | （0．11） | －0．21 | （0．22） | －0．76 | （0．21） | 0.55 | （0．20） | －0．05 | （0．02） |
|  | Belgium | －0．42 | （0．11） | 0.09 | （0．05） | －0．02 | （0．06） | －0．04 | （0．08） | －0．61 | （0．10） | －0．10 | （0．12） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Canada | －0．24 | （0．11） | －0．11 | （0．03） | －0．06 | （0．04） | 0.19 | （0．08） | －0．21 | （0．08） | 0.11 | （0．10） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Chile | 0.44 | （0．49） | －0．02 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．07） | －0．11 | （0．36） | －0．68 | （0．30） | －0．19 | （0．07） | －0．03 | （0．01） |
|  | Czech Republic | －0．90 | （0．28） | 0.08 | （0．08） | －0．21 | （0．09） | 0.10 | （0．38） | －0．34 | （0．39） | －0．51 | （0．18） | －0．01 | （0．03） |
|  | Denmark | －0．07 | （0．17） | －0．01 | （0．05） | －0．34 | （0．07） | －0．14 | （0．16） | －0．30 | （0．11） | 0.41 | （0．15） | －0．05 | （0．02） |
|  | Estonia | 0.18 | （0．20） | －0．08 | （0．05） | －0．30 | （0．07） | 0.06 | （0．15） | －0．39 | （0．12） | －0．11 | （0．16） | 0.03 | （0．02） |
|  | Finland | 0.20 | （0．14） | －0．16 | （0．04） | －0．24 | （0．06） | －0．18 | （0．13） | －0．27 | （0．13） | －0．03 | （0．16） | 0.08 | （0．03） |
|  | France | －0．20 | （0．19） | 0.05 | （0．06） | －0．12 | （0．07） | －0．08 | （0．17） | －0．54 | （0．17） | －0．13 | （0．18） | －0．03 | （0．02） |
|  | Germany | －1．03 | （0．21） | 0.04 | （0．06） | －0．05 | （0．10） | 0.10 | （0．19） | －0．53 | （0．14） | 0.23 | （0．17） | －0．02 | （0．02） |
|  | Greece | 0.16 | （0．18） | 0.11 | （0．04） | 0.01 | （0．06） | 0.00 | （0．19） | －0．20 | （0．14） | 0.23 | （0．12） | 0.12 | （0．04） |
|  | Hungary | －1．66 | （0．65） | 0.04 | （0．06） | 0.02 | （0．11） | －0．19 | （0．47） | 0.10 | （0．41） | －0．66 | （0．16） | －0．04 | （0．02） |
|  | Iceland | －0．30 | （0．26） | －0．15 | （0．05） | －0．42 | （0．07） | －0．23 | （0．32） | －0．12 | （0．35） | 0.28 | （0．15） | 0.05 | （0．03） |
|  | Ireland | －0．82 | （0．22） | －0．08 | （0．05） | －0．26 | （0．10） | 0.08 | （0．23） | －0．15 | （0．19） | －0．22 | （0．16） | －0．05 | （0．03） |
|  | Israel | 0.14 | （0．18） | －0．08 | （0．04） | 0.07 | （0．08） | －0．07 | （0．11） | －0．03 | （0．12） | 0.10 | （0．12） | －0．06 | （0．01） |
|  | Italy | －0．40 | （0．11） | 0.08 | （0．02） | －0．11 | （0．04） | －0．08 | （0．06） | －0．09 | （0．11） | －0．35 | （0．08） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Japan | 0.39 | （0．64） | －0．07 | （0．07） | －0．37 | （0．10） | c | c | c | c | －0．07 | （0．30） | －0．02 | （0．02） |
|  | Korea | 2.12 | （0．45） | －0．10 | （0．06） | 0.00 | （0．08） | c | c | c | c | －0．23 | （0．17） | －0．02 | （0．01） |
|  | Luxembourg | －0．87 | （0．08） | 0.01 | （0．04） | －0．01 | （0．07） | 0.16 | （0．12） | －0．30 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．08） | 0.03 | （0．01） |
|  | Mexico | －0．48 | （0．22） | 0.06 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．03） | 0.24 | （0．12） | －0．11 | （0．13） | －0．05 | （0．05） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．33 | （0．23） | 0.11 | （0．07） | －0．09 | （0．09） | 0.08 | （0．25） | －0．69 | （0．15） | －0．29 | （0．20） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | New Zealand | －0．56 | （0．15） | －0．19 | （0．05） | 0.06 | （0．09） | －0．20 | （0．12） | 0.30 | （0．10） | －0．48 | （0．17） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Norway | －0．54 | （0．17） | －0．15 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．08） | －0．28 | （0．19） | －0．05 | （0．19） | 0.24 | （0．20） | 0.01 | （0．04） |
|  | Poland | 0.18 | （0．91） | －0．04 | （0．04） | －0．48 | （0．07） | －0．20 | （0．68） | c | c | 0.23 | （0．16） | 0.06 | （0．05） |
|  | Portugal | 0.49 | （0．28） | －0．01 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．08） | 0.31 | （0．27） | －0．41 | （0．16） | 0.04 | （0．10） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Slovak Republic | －1．29 | （0．66） | －0．03 | （0．05） | －0．21 | （0．08） | －0．52 | （0．17） | c | c | －0．14 | （0．17） | 0.04 | （0．03） |
|  | Slovenia | －0．29 | （0．18） | 0.10 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．07） | －0．13 | （0．21） | －0．16 | （0．19） | －0．16 | （0．12） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Spain | 0.26 | （0．12） | －0．06 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．05） | －0．20 | （0．09） | －0．62 | （0．09） | 0.07 | （0．08） | －0．02 | （0．01） |
|  | Sweden | 0.74 | （0．15） | －0．11 | （0．05） | －0．24 | （0．07） | 0.10 | （0．18） | －0．53 | （0．16） | 0.02 | （0．18） | 0.03 | （0．03） |
|  | Switzerland | －0．79 | （0．12） | 0.05 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．08） | －0．18 | （0．09） | －0．38 | （0．08） | 0.63 | （0．13） | 0.04 | （0．01） |
|  | Turkey | －0．02 | （0．39） | 0.06 | （0．03） | －0．28 | （0．06） | －0．23 | （0．16） | －0．20 | （0．33） | －0．20 | （0．08） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | United Kingdom | －0．69 | （0．16） | －0．14 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．06） | 0.36 | （0．16） | －0．42 | （0．14） | －0．10 | （0．10） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | United States | －0．99 | （0．17） | －0．17 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．16） | －0．12 | （0．14） | －0．29 | （0．16） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | OECD average | －0．26 | （0．06） | －0．03 | （0．01） | －0．11 | （0．01） | －0．04 | （0．04） | －0．29 | （0．04） | －0．03 | （0．03） | 0.00 | （0．00） |
|  | Albania | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| E | Argentina | －0．15 | （0．27） | －0．02 | （0．04） | 0.04 | （0．07） | 0.31 | （0．26） | －0．35 | （0．14） | －0．24 | （0．12） | 0.00 | （0．02） |
| む | Brazil | 0.19 | （0．44） | 0.09 | （0．03） | －0．01 | （0．04） | －0．03 | （0．20） | －0．87 | （0．29） | －0．05 | （0．10） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Bulgaria | 0.73 | （0．60） | －0．12 | （0．04） | 0.00 | （0．06） | 0.02 | （0．17） | c | c | －0．07 | （0．10） | －0．04 | （0．02） |
|  | Colombia | －2．25 | （0．96） | 0.05 | （0．04） | －0．09 | （0．07） | －0．28 | （0．38） | c | c | －0．26 | （0．11） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Costa Rica | 0.36 | （0．42） | 0.12 | （0．04） | 0.11 | （0．07） | 0.31 | （0．38） | －0．06 | （0．18） | 0.03 | （0．13） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Croatia | －0．60 | （0．37） | 0.07 | （0．04） | －0．32 | （0．07） | －0．05 | （0．34） | －0．13 | （0．10） | －0．07 | （0．16） | －0．04 | （0．02） |
|  | Cyprus＊ | 0.01 | （0．14） | －0．06 | （0．04） | －0．15 | （0．06） | －0．15 | （0．11） | 0.00 | （0．13） | －0．16 | （0．10） | 0.01 | （0．02） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | －1．61 | （0．29） | －0．04 | （0．07） | －0．16 | （0．09） | －0．61 | （0．16） | 0.15 | （0．10） | －0．36 | （0．14） | －0．02 | （0．02） |
|  | Indonesia | 0.24 | （0．69） | 0.11 | （0．05） | －0．31 | （0．07） | 0.22 | （0．10） | c | c | －0．02 | （0．12） | －0．05 | （0．02） |
|  | Jordan | －0．16 | （0．20） | －0．03 | （0．04） | －0．27 | （0．08） | －0．28 | （0．14） | 0.04 | （0．10） | 0.04 | （0．11） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Kazakhstan | 0.26 | （0．26） | －0．22 | （0．05） | －0．27 | （0．08） | －0．42 | （0．10） | 0.10 | （0．10） | －0．09 | （0．20） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Latvia | 0.61 | （0．21） | －0．01 | （0．05） | －0．32 | （0．09） | －0．17 | （0．14） | 0.13 | （0．14） | －0．09 | （0．16） | 0.01 | （0．03） |
|  | Liechtenstein | －0．52 | （1．02） | －0．26 | （0．20） | －0．38 | （0．36） | c | c | －0．39 | （0．41） | －1．49 | （1．00） | 0.14 | （0．23） |
|  | Lithuania | 0.44 | （0．33） | 0.02 | （0．04） | －0．45 | （0．06） | 0.05 | （0．16） | －0．43 | （0．26） | －0．21 | （0．18） | 0.02 | （0．03） |
|  | Macao－China | －1．49 | （0．23） | －0．11 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．07） | 0.77 | （0．13） | 0.02 | （0．07） | 0.54 | （0．10） | －0．05 | （0．01） |
|  | Malaysia | －0．42 | （0．30） | －0．01 | （0．04） | －0．26 | （0．07） | 0.23 | （0．10） | －0．47 | （0．25） | －0．14 | （0．10） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Montenegro | －0．36 | （0．38） | 0.11 | （0．04） | －0．16 | （0．06） | 0.00 | （0．32） | －0．16 | （0．15） | －0．29 | （0．15） | －0．02 | （0．01） |
|  | Peru | 0.05 | （0．53） | 0.04 | （0．04） | －0．05 | （0．07） | －0．18 | （0．21） | c | c | －0．25 | （0．11） | －0．02 | （0．01） |
|  | Qatar | －0．59 | （0．10） | 0.04 | （0．03） | －0．18 | （0．05） | －0．08 | （0．06） | 0.86 | （0．06） | 0.06 | （0．07） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Romania | －0．55 | （0．95） | －0．01 | （0．04） | －0．19 | （0．07） | 0.18 | （0．25） | c | c | －0．30 | （0．12） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.07 | （0．25） | －0．17 | （0．06） | －0．22 | （0．06） | 0.08 | （0．20） | －0．11 | （0．11） | 0.10 | （0．19） | 0.06 | （0．02） |
|  | Serbia | －0．31 | （0．29） | 0.15 | （0．04） | －0．33 | （0．08） | －0．05 | （0．22） | 0.00 | （0．15） | －0．07 | （0．16） | －0．03 | （0．02） |
|  | Shanghai－China | －1．08 | （0．56） | 0.06 | （0．05） | －0．28 | （0．09） | －0．12 | （0．33） | －0．10 | （0．45） | －0．22 | （0．11） | 0.00 | （0．01） |
|  | Singapore | －1．19 | （0．11） | －0．16 | （0．05） | －0．22 | （0．07） | －0．12 | （0．09） | 0.12 | （0．10） | 0.12 | （0．13） | －0．05 | （0．01） |
|  | Chinese Taipei | －0．71 | （0．46） | －0．08 | （0．05） | －0．24 | （0．08） | 0.06 | （0．11） | c | c | －0．02 | （0．17） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Thailand | －1．47 | （0．64） | 0.06 | （0．04） | －0．38 | （0．07） | 0.21 | （0．09） | 0.62 | （0．61） | －0．28 | （0．09） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Tunisia | －0．07 | （0．57） | －0．01 | （0．03） | －0．18 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．36） | c | c | 0.00 | （0．08） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | United Arab Emirates | －1．32 | （0．18） | 0.00 | （0．05） | －0．18 | （0．07） | 0.12 | （0．14） | 0.75 | （0．07） | 0.04 | （0．11） | －0．01 | （0．01） |
|  | Uruguay | －0．52 | （0．46） | 0.05 | （0．04） | 0.12 | （0．08） | －0．04 | （0．24） | c | c | －0．12 | （0．13） | 0.01 | （0．01） |
|  | Viet Nam | －1．28 | （1．40） | 0.01 | （0．04） | －0．16 | （0．08） | －0．55 | （0．31） | c | c | －0．36 | （0．13） | －0．04 | （0．01） |

[^46]StatLink 齐政四 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957517
[Part 2/2]
Relationship between student having arrived late for school and student and school features
Table IV.5.16 Results based on students' and school principals' reports


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)

1. Logistic regression: LATE $=$ Intercept + variables listed in this table; where LATE ( $0=$ did not arrive late; and $1=$ arrived late ).

* See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

StatLink 京ilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
[Part 1/3]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher-student relations
Table IV.5.17 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher-student relations |  | Percentage of students reporting that they agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students get along well with most teachers | Most teachers are interested in my well-being |  | Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say |  | If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers |  | Most of my teachers treat me fairly |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.17 | (0.01) | 78.0 | (0.6) | 81.8 | (0.5) | 71.9 | (0.6) | 86.6 | (0.5) | 86.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | -0.32 | (0.02) | 72.7 | (1.1) | 63.9 | (1.0) | 57.8 | (1.1) | 67.1 | (1.0) | 77.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Belgium | -0.40 | (0.01) | 68.7 | (0.7) | 68.6 | (0.7) | 65.6 | (0.7) | 80.8 | (0.5) | 75.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Canada | -0.16 | (0.01) | 73.5 | (0.5) | 78.0 | (0.4) | 72.5 | (0.4) | 90.2 | (0.3) | 84.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.51 | (0.02) | 63.7 | (1.0) | 65.8 | (0.9) | 55.8 | (1.0) | 77.7 | (0.7) | 73.7 | (0.7) |
|  | Denmark | -0.11 | (0.02) | 77.7 | (0.9) | 79.6 | (0.7) | 71.3 | (1.0) | 82.0 | (0.6) | 90.4 | (0.5) |
|  | Finland | -0.38 | (0.02) | 72.8 | (0.9) | 64.3 | (0.9) | 64.2 | (0.8) | 85.9 | (0.6) | 80.9 | (0.7) |
|  | France | -0.45 | (0.02) | 62.1 | (1.1) | 65.6 | (1.0) | 66.0 | (1.0) | 81.0 | (0.7) | 65.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Germany | -0.38 | (0.02) | 65.5 | (0.9) | 59.7 | (1.1) | 58.0 | (0.9) | 67.2 | (0.9) | 75.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Greece | -0.44 | (0.03) | 68.2 | (1.2) | 60.3 | (1.2) | 66.3 | (1.0) | 68.0 | (1.3) | 70.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Hungary | -0.46 | (0.02) | 63.2 | (1.2) | 59.2 | (1.0) | 74.5 | (0.9) | 71.8 | (0.9) | 68.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Iceland | -0.34 | (0.02) | 70.2 | (0.7) | 69.5 | (0.7) | 65.3 | (0.8) | 76.8 | (0.7) | 76.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Ireland | -0.36 | (0.02) | 71.6 | (1.0) | 78.2 | (0.9) | 59.9 | (0.9) | 76.8 | (0.9) | 82.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Italy | -0.61 | (0.02) | 59.4 | (0.9) | 65.2 | (0.9) | 59.2 | (0.9) | 58.2 | (1.0) | 64.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Japan | -0.71 | (0.02) | 64.0 | (1.1) | 44.9 | (1.0) | 53.7 | (1.0) | 57.5 | (0.8) | 67.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Korea | -0.42 | (0.02) | 84.4 | (0.7) | 65.0 | (0.9) | 54.8 | (0.9) | 85.3 | (0.6) | 69.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.69 | (0.02) | 56.3 | (0.8) | 52.5 | (0.9) | 50.1 | (0.8) | 53.4 | (0.7) | 66.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Mexico | 0.12 | (0.02) | 85.2 | (0.6) | 85.3 | (0.6) | 76.9 | (0.7) | 79.8 | (0.8) | 83.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.41 | (0.02) | 69.9 | (1.2) | 67.6 | (1.0) | 64.2 | (1.2) | 84.0 | (0.9) | 84.2 | (0.8) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.26 | (0.02) | 71.9 | (0.7) | 78.5 | (0.7) | 67.7 | (0.9) | 85.0 | (0.6) | 84.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Norway | -0.43 | (0.02) | 74.5 | (1.0) | 66.5 | (1.1) | 55.4 | (1.0) | 75.3 | (0.8) | 73.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Poland | -0.60 | (0.02) | 66.7 | (1.0) | 47.4 | (1.0) | 61.8 | (1.1) | 67.8 | (1.1) | 68.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Portugal | -0.14 | (0.02) | 83.5 | (0.8) | 80.4 | (0.8) | 76.4 | (0.8) | 84.4 | (0.7) | 84.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.57 | (0.02) | 64.6 | (1.0) | 47.3 | (1.0) | 62.0 | (1.1) | 66.7 | (0.8) | 76.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | -0.46 | (0.02) | 62.5 | (1.0) | 69.9 | (0.8) | 65.8 | (0.8) | 65.4 | (0.9) | 75.0 | (0.7) |
|  | Sweden | -0.17 | (0.02) | 80.5 | (0.8) | 78.3 | (0.7) | 71.9 | (0.9) | 81.1 | (0.7) | 83.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.08 | (0.02) | 69.7 | (1.1) | 74.3 | (0.9) | 70.2 | (0.9) | 82.2 | (0.6) | 81.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Turkey | -0.19 | (0.03) | 79.7 | (1.1) | 60.3 | (1.2) | 74.0 | (0.9) | 74.7 | (0.8) | 66.4 | (0.9) |
|  | United States | -0.18 | (0.02) | 71.0 | (0.8) | 75.3 | (0.7) | 69.8 | (0.8) | 88.4 | (0.5) | 87.2 | (0.5) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.35 | (0.00) | 70.8 | (0.2) | 67.4 | (0.2) | 64.9 | (0.2) | 75.9 | (0.1) | 76.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 0.16 | (0.02) | 79.6 | (0.8) | 82.3 | (0.8) | 79.2 | (0.7) | 88.1 | (0.6) | 85.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.30 | (0.02) | 84.4 | (1.0) | 65.3 | (1.1) | 66.2 | (1.0) | 82.6 | (0.7) | 75.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.22 | (0.01) | 91.3 | (0.5) | 93.2 | (0.4) | 71.6 | (0.8) | 94.2 | (0.4) | 91.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Latvia | -0.33 | (0.02) | 74.1 | (1.0) | 76.2 | (1.4) | 69.7 | (1.1) | 71.2 | (1.0) | 78.7 | (0.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.33 | (0.04) | 66.0 | (2.4) | 65.9 | (2.5) | 60.4 | (2.1) | 71.7 | (2.5) | 78.7 | (2.3) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.43 | (0.03) | 80.6 | (1.3) | 57.7 | (1.7) | 57.9 | (1.7) | 75.2 | (1.3) | 72.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.36 | (0.02) | 76.3 | (0.8) | 58.6 | (1.1) | 73.6 | (0.8) | 61.3 | (1.4) | 77.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Thailand | 0.12 | (0.02) | 93.5 | (0.4) | 91.1 | (0.5) | 83.6 | (0.7) | 85.6 | (0.6) | 91.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.05 | (0.03) | 63.8 | (1.0) | 59.8 | (1.0) | 78.1 | (0.8) | 77.6 | (0.9) | 75.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.12 | (0.02) | 81.1 | (0.9) | 77.2 | (1.2) | 77.7 | (0.7) | 76.9 | (0.8) | 76.5 | (0.7) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher-student relations have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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Table IV.5.17 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Percentage of students reporting that they agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Index of teacher-student relations |  | Students get along well with most teachers |  | Most teachers are interested in my well-being |  | Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say |  | If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers |  | Most of my teachers treat me fairly |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 0.15 | (0.01) | 84.1 | (0.4) | 87.3 | (0.4) | 79.5 | (0.4) | 89.5 | (0.3) | 86.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | -0.14 | (0.03) | 81.1 | (1.0) | 70.2 | (1.1) | 61.5 | (1.1) | 63.8 | (1.2) | 80.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Belgium | -0.11 | (0.02) | 79.8 | (0.6) | 77.4 | (0.7) | 74.1 | (0.7) | 85.1 | (0.6) | 79.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Canada | 0.28 | (0.01) | 85.5 | (0.5) | 86.1 | (0.4) | 80.7 | (0.5) | 91.8 | (0.3) | 89.8 | (0.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.16 | (0.03) | 80.8 | (1.1) | 72.0 | (1.2) | 68.4 | (1.1) | 87.4 | (0.8) | 78.9 | (1.1) |
|  | Denmark | 0.15 | (0.02) | 88.7 | (0.6) | 85.3 | (0.7) | 80.1 | (0.8) | 84.6 | (0.7) | 87.4 | (0.7) |
|  | Finland | -0.09 | (0.02) | 79.6 | (0.9) | 73.0 | (0.8) | 73.8 | (0.8) | 88.6 | (0.7) | 83.4 | (0.6) |
|  | France | -0.17 | (0.02) | 78.0 | (0.7) | 70.7 | (1.0) | 72.2 | (0.9) | 81.9 | (0.7) | 69.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Germany | -0.22 | (0.02) | 76.3 | (1.0) | 66.9 | (1.1) | 66.6 | (1.0) | 66.3 | (1.1) | 75.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Greece | -0.13 | (0.02) | 74.1 | (1.0) | 76.5 | (0.9) | 70.2 | (0.9) | 74.0 | (0.9) | 73.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Hungary | -0.02 | (0.02) | 83.4 | (0.8) | 73.0 | (0.9) | 82.7 | (0.8) | 76.8 | (0.9) | 76.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Iceland | 0.21 | (0.02) | 84.1 | (0.7) | 85.1 | (0.8) | 82.0 | (0.8) | 87.4 | (0.7) | 84.4 | (0.8) |
|  | Ireland | 0.03 | (0.02) | 82.2 | (0.9) | 83.9 | (0.8) | 73.3 | (0.9) | 83.8 | (0.9) | 86.7 | (0.6) |
|  | Italy | -0.16 | (0.01) | 74.9 | (0.5) | 71.4 | (0.5) | 69.5 | (0.5) | 70.7 | (0.5) | 81.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Japan | -0.17 | (0.02) | 79.9 | (0.8) | 58.8 | (1.0) | 73.0 | (0.9) | 81.5 | (0.7) | 79.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Korea | -0.12 | (0.03) | 89.9 | (0.8) | 71.9 | (1.0) | 68.8 | (1.0) | 89.0 | (0.7) | 79.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.05 | (0.02) | 85.8 | (0.6) | 66.2 | (0.8) | 70.0 | (0.8) | 72.6 | (0.9) | 78.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | 0.47 | (0.01) | 90.8 | (0.3) | 89.6 | (0.3) | 83.9 | (0.4) | 85.0 | (0.4) | 88.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.15 | (0.02) | 83.5 | (0.9) | 78.3 | (0.8) | 74.1 | (0.9) | 82.8 | (1.1) | 85.5 | (0.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.11 | (0.02) | 84.1 | (0.9) | 85.1 | (0.8) | 78.1 | (0.9) | 88.5 | (0.7) | 87.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Norway | -0.14 | (0.02) | 81.6 | (0.8) | 74.8 | (1.0) | 67.2 | (1.0) | 80.6 | (0.9) | 77.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Poland | -0.42 | (0.02) | 74.1 | (1.0) | 53.8 | (1.1) | 62.5 | (1.1) | 75.5 | (1.0) | 66.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Portugal | 0.32 | (0.02) | 90.9 | (0.6) | 91.6 | (0.6) | 85.3 | (0.7) | 91.5 | (0.6) | 83.7 | (0.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.18 | (0.02) | 76.9 | (1.2) | 77.6 | (1.0) | 73.6 | (1.0) | 75.2 | (1.0) | 76.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Spain | 0.00 | (0.02) | 78.4 | (0.7) | 78.9 | (0.6) | 73.7 | (0.5) | 76.3 | (0.7) | 81.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Sweden | 0.08 | (0.03) | 84.6 | (0.9) | 81.5 | (0.8) | 76.6 | (1.1) | 83.0 | (0.9) | 83.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.11 | (0.02) | 81.9 | (0.8) | 78.3 | (0.8) | 75.7 | (0.7) | 84.4 | (0.7) | 82.5 | (0.8) |
|  | Turkey | 0.19 | (0.02) | 88.4 | (0.6) | 75.4 | (0.9) | 84.0 | (0.7) | 76.8 | (0.9) | 71.9 | (0.9) |
|  | United States | 0.21 | (0.03) | 82.6 | (0.8) | 86.1 | (0.8) | 78.3 | (1.0) | 89.9 | (0.6) | 89.7 | (0.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.00 | (0.00) | 82.3 | (0.1) | 76.8 | (0.2) | 74.5 | (0.2) | 81.5 | (0.1) | 80.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 0.25 | (0.02) | 84.0 | (0.7) | 81.8 | (0.5) | 75.8 | (0.6) | 85.6 | (0.4) | 85.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.03 | (0.02) | 92.4 | (0.5) | 78.9 | (0.9) | 70.5 | (1.1) | 91.3 | (0.6) | 82.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.42 | (0.02) | 94.5 | (0.5) | 94.4 | (0.5) | 78.1 | (0.7) | 93.4 | (0.5) | 88.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Latvia | 0.16 | (0.02) | 83.9 | (0.8) | 91.8 | (0.6) | 74.6 | (1.1) | 89.9 | (0.8) | 85.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.05 | (0.07) | 81.5 | (2.8) | 74.4 | (3.0) | 70.6 | (3.2) | 78.7 | (3.0) | 83.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.04 | (0.02) | 91.4 | (0.5) | 81.9 | (0.7) | 65.9 | (0.8) | 86.5 | (0.6) | 74.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.14 | (0.03) | 87.8 | (0.7) | 66.1 | (0.9) | 80.3 | (0.9) | 86.4 | (0.9) | 83.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Thailand | 0.30 | (0.02) | 90.2 | (0.5) | 89.1 | (0.6) | 86.6 | (0.6) | 90.4 | (0.5) | 86.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.02 | (0.03) | 78.1 | (0.9) | 64.2 | (1.1) | 71.9 | (1.1) | 73.8 | (0.8) | 71.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.19 | (0.03) | 87.4 | (0.8) | 83.8 | (0.8) | 80.1 | (0.8) | 83.4 | (0.8) | 75.5 | (0.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher-student relations have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher-student relations |  | Percentage of students reporting that they agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students get along well with most teachers | Most teachers are interested in my well-being |  | Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say |  | If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers |  | Most of my teachers treat me fairly |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  | 0.32 | (0.02) | 6.1 | (0.7) | 5.5 | (0.6) | 7.6 | (0.8) | 2.9 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Austria | 0.18 | (0.04) | 8.3 | (1.5) | 6.3 | (1.5) | 3.7 | (1.6) | -3.3 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Belgium | 0.29 | (0.02) | 11.1 | (1.0) | 8.7 | (0.9) | 8.5 | (1.0) | 4.3 | (0.8) | 3.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Canada | 0.44 | (0.02) | 12.0 | (0.7) | 8.0 | (0.6) | 8.2 | (0.7) | 1.6 | (0.4) | 5.5 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.34 | (0.03) | 17.1 | (1.5) | 6.2 | (1.5) | 12.6 | (1.5) | 9.7 | (1.1) | 5.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Denmark | 0.26 | (0.03) | 11.0 | (1.1) | 5.7 | (1.0) | 8.8 | (1.3) | 2.6 | (0.9) | -3.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Finland | 0.28 | (0.02) | 6.8 | (1.3) | 8.8 | (1.2) | 9.7 | (1.2) | 2.7 | (0.9) | 2.5 | (0.9) |
|  | France | 0.28 | (0.03) | 15.9 | (1.3) | 5.1 | (1.4) | 6.3 | (1.4) | 0.9 | (1.0) | 3.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Germany | 0.16 | (0.03) | 10.8 | (1.3) | 7.2 | (1.5) | 8.6 | (1.3) | -0.9 | (1.4) | 0.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Greece | 0.31 | (0.04) | 5.8 | (1.5) | 16.2 | (1.5) | 3.9 | (1.4) | 6.0 | (1.6) | 2.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Hungary | 0.44 | (0.03) | 20.3 | (1.4) | 13.8 | (1.4) | 8.3 | (1.2) | 5.0 | (1.3) | 8.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Iceland | 0.55 | (0.03) | 13.9 | (1.0) | 15.5 | (1.1) | 16.7 | (1.1) | 10.5 | (1.0) | 8.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.39 | (0.03) | 10.6 | (1.3) | 5.7 | (1.2) | 13.4 | (1.3) | 7.0 | (1.2) | 4.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Italy | 0.45 | (0.02) | 15.5 | (1.1) | 6.2 | (1.0) | 10.3 | (1.0) | 12.4 | (1.1) | 16.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Japan | 0.54 | (0.03) | 16.0 | (1.3) | 13.9 | (1.5) | 19.3 | (1.3) | 24.0 | (1.1) | 12.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Korea | 0.30 | (0.03) | 5.5 | (1.1) | 7.0 | (1.4) | 14.0 | (1.3) | 3.7 | (0.9) | 10.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.64 | (0.03) | 29.5 | (1.0) | 13.6 | (1.2) | 19.9 | (1.2) | 19.2 | (1.2) | 11.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Mexico | 0.35 | (0.02) | 5.6 | (0.6) | 4.3 | (0.7) | 7.0 | (0.8) | 5.2 | (0.9) | 4.7 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.26 | (0.03) | 13.7 | (1.5) | 10.8 | (1.3) | 9.9 | (1.5) | -1.2 | (1.4) | 1.2 | (1.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.36 | (0.03) | 12.2 | (1.2) | 6.6 | (1.1) | 10.4 | (1.3) | 3.5 | (0.9) | 3.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Norway | 0.29 | (0.03) | 7.1 | (1.3) | 8.3 | (1.5) | 11.9 | (1.4) | 5.3 | (1.2) | 3.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Poland | 0.18 | (0.03) | 7.4 | (1.4) | 6.4 | (1.5) | 0.7 | (1.5) | 7.7 | (1.5) | -2.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Portugal | 0.46 | (0.03) | 7.5 | (1.0) | 11.1 | (1.0) | 8.9 | (1.1) | 7.1 | (1.0) | -0.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.39 | (0.03) | 12.3 | (1.6) | 30.3 | (1.4) | 11.6 | (1.5) | 8.5 | (1.3) | 0.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Spain | 0.46 | (0.02) | 16.0 | (1.2) | 9.0 | (1.0) | 7.9 | (1.0) | 10.8 | (1.1) | 6.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Sweden | 0.25 | (0.03) | 4.1 | (1.2) | 3.3 | (1.0) | 4.7 | (1.4) | 1.9 | (1.1) | -0.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.19 | (0.03) | 12.2 | (1.4) | 4.1 | (1.2) | 5.5 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (0.9) | 0.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Turkey | 0.38 | (0.03) | 8.7 | (1.2) | 15.1 | (1.5) | 10.0 | (1.1) | 2.1 | (1.2) | 5.4 | (1.2) |
|  | United States | 0.38 | (0.03) | 11.6 | (1.2) | 10.9 | (1.1) | 8.5 | (1.2) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 2.5 | (0.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.35 | (0.01) | 11.5 | (0.2) | 9.4 | (0.2) | 9.5 | (0.2) | 5.6 | (0.2) | 4.1 | (0.2) |
|  | Brazil | 0.08 | (0.03) | 4.4 | (1.0) | -0.5 | (0.9) | -3.4 | (0.9) | -2.5 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.33 | (0.03) | 8.0 | (1.1) | 13.7 | (1.5) | 4.3 | (1.5) | 8.7 | (1.0) | 7.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.21 | (0.02) | 3.2 | (0.7) | 1.2 | (0.6) | 6.5 | (1.0) | -0.8 | (0.6) | -3.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Latvia | 0.49 | (0.03) | 9.8 | (1.3) | 15.6 | (1.5) | 4.9 | (1.5) | 18.7 | (1.3) | 6.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.38 | (0.08) | 15.6 | (3.7) | 8.5 | (3.9) | 10.2 | (3.8) | 6.9 | (3.9) | 5.0 | (3.5) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.38 | (0.03) | 10.8 | (1.4) | 24.2 | (1.8) | 8.0 | (1.9) | 11.3 | (1.4) | 2.2 | (1.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.50 | (0.04) | 11.5 | (1.0) | 7.5 | (1.4) | 6.7 | (1.2) | 25.1 | (1.6) | 5.9 | (1.2) |
|  | Thailand | 0.17 | (0.03) | -3.3 | (0.7) | -1.9 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.9) | 4.8 | (0.8) | -4.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Tunisia | 0.03 | (0.04) | 14.3 | (1.3) | 4.3 | (1.5) | -6.2 | (1.3) | -3.8 | (1.2) | -3.3 | (1.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.31 | (0.03) | 6.3 | (1.2) | 6.6 | (1.4) | 2.4 | (1.1) | 6.5 | (1.2) | -1.0 | (1.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher-student relations have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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Table IV.5.18 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of disciplinary climate |  | Percentage of students reporting that the following phenomena occur "never or hardly ever" or "some lessons" in their mathematics lessons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students don't listen to what the teacher says | There is noise and disorder |  | The teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down |  | Students cannot work well |  | Student don't start working for a long time after the lessons begins |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.16 | (0.02) | 66.5 | (0.7) | 58.2 | (0.8) | 68.1 | (0.7) | 80.3 | (0.7) | 73.3 | (0.6) |
| نِّ | Austria | 0.03 | (0.03) | 69.1 | (1.0) | 72.8 | (1.1) | 67.0 | (1.2) | 73.3 | (1.0) | 69.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Belgium | -0.12 | (0.02) | 72.4 | (0.7) | 62.6 | (0.9) | 65.9 | (0.8) | 80.6 | (0.6) | 66.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Canada | -0.14 | (0.01) | 71.1 | (0.5) | 61.2 | (0.7) | 72.2 | (0.6) | 82.3 | (0.4) | 69.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.17 | (0.03) | 64.0 | (1.2) | 66.3 | (1.4) | 66.4 | (1.4) | 75.3 | (0.9) | 75.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Denmark | -0.22 | (0.02) | 67.9 | (0.9) | 56.8 | (1.3) | 72.4 | (1.2) | 80.3 | (0.9) | 73.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Finland | -0.28 | (0.02) | 63.8 | (0.9) | 51.8 | (1.1) | 65.2 | (1.1) | 81.2 | (0.7) | 68.0 | (0.9) |
|  | France | -0.26 | (0.02) | 66.9 | (0.8) | 54.5 | (1.1) | 62.0 | (1.1) | 75.1 | (0.9) | 58.1 | (0.9) |
|  | Germany | 0.11 | (0.02) | 77.8 | (0.8) | 74.7 | (1.0) | 68.5 | (1.1) | 74.5 | (0.8) | 74.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Greece | -0.35 | (0.02) | 65.0 | (1.3) | 57.0 | (1.4) | 64.7 | (1.3) | 71.3 | (1.2) | 60.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Hungary | -0.01 | (0.03) | 72.3 | (1.1) | 71.5 | (1.1) | 70.2 | (1.3) | 77.7 | (0.8) | 81.2 | (0.9) |
|  | Iceland | -0.28 | (0.01) | 69.4 | (0.7) | 59.2 | (0.8) | 63.9 | (0.8) | 74.8 | (0.7) | 73.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Ireland | 0.08 | (0.03) | 67.8 | (0.9) | 68.4 | (1.2) | 74.6 | (1.0) | 80.8 | (0.9) | 78.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Italy | -0.24 | (0.02) | 63.3 | (1.0) | 58.3 | (1.3) | 61.4 | (1.2) | 75.1 | (1.0) | 67.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Japan | 0.23 | (0.03) | 80.9 | (0.9) | 83.1 | (1.0) | 86.3 | (0.8) | 75.2 | (1.0) | 84.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Korea | -0.04 | (0.02) | 72.7 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | 81.1 | (0.7) | 82.1 | (0.7) | 79.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.33 | (0.01) | 64.8 | (0.7) | 51.6 | (0.8) | 57.2 | (0.8) | 60.7 | (0.8) | 64.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | -0.15 | (0.02) | 71.5 | (0.7) | 73.2 | (0.8) | 73.7 | (1.0) | 76.0 | (0.7) | 65.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.26 | (0.02) | 72.8 | (1.0) | 58.4 | (1.3) | 63.7 | (1.3) | 80.9 | (0.9) | 61.5 | (1.1) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.30 | (0.02) | 61.6 | (0.7) | 52.6 | (0.9) | 62.9 | (0.9) | 77.2 | (0.7) | 68.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Norway | -0.36 | (0.02) | 66.0 | (0.9) | 58.8 | (1.2) | 64.1 | (1.1) | 71.7 | (1.0) | 63.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Poland | -0.07 | (0.03) | 66.9 | (1.2) | 73.1 | (1.3) | 69.6 | (1.3) | 78.6 | (1.0) | 77.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Portugal | -0.14 | (0.02) | 71.9 | (0.8) | 64.9 | (1.1) | 69.8 | (1.0) | 77.6 | (0.9) | 72.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.24 | (0.02) | 60.9 | (0.9) | 65.8 | (0.9) | 65.9 | (0.9) | 74.9 | (0.7) | 71.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Spain | -0.18 | (0.03) | 70.4 | (1.0) | 64.9 | (1.2) | 64.3 | (1.2) | 76.1 | (1.0) | 65.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Sweden | -0.19 | (0.02) | 74.1 | (0.9) | 64.1 | (1.2) | 67.3 | (1.1) | 80.1 | (0.9) | 71.6 | (1.2) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.07 | (0.03) | 72.4 | (0.9) | 67.3 | (1.1) | 67.6 | (1.0) | 74.1 | (0.9) | 68.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Turkey | -0.26 | (0.02) | 76.1 | (1.1) | 67.2 | (1.1) | 64.5 | (1.1) | 69.1 | (1.3) | 69.0 | (1.3) |
|  | United States | -0.05 | (0.02) | 68.0 | (0.8) | 66.0 | (0.9) | 73.9 | (0.8) | 81.1 | (0.7) | 73.1 | (0.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.15 | (0.00) | 69.3 | (0.2) | 61.5 | (0.2) | 68.1 | (0.2) | 76.5 | (0.2) | 70.6 | (0.2) |


| \% Brazil | -0.46 | (0.02) | 65.4 | (1.1) | 62.0 | (1.1) | 61.8 | (1.0) | 70.3 | (0.8) | 37.0 | (1.0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Hong Kong-China | -0.02 | (0.02) | 79.5 | (0.8) | 82.7 | (0.8) | 81.1 | (0.9) | 80.5 | (0.8) | 80.2 | (0.8) |
| ะ Indonesia | -0.10 | (0.02) | 74.8 | (0.8) | 67.7 | (0.9) | 62.5 | (1.0) | 78.4 | (0.7) | 70.4 | (0.8) |
| Latvia | 0.11 | (0.03) | 73.3 | (1.0) | 80.0 | (1.2) | 79.6 | (1.1) | 81.7 | (1.0) | 79.4 | (1.1) |
| Liechtenstein | 0.05 | (0.04) | 73.8 | (2.5) | 72.2 | (2.1) | 67.0 | (2.5) | 71.8 | (2.4) | 75.0 | (2.1) |
| Macao-China | -0.07 | (0.02) | 81.6 | (1.3) | 84.5 | (1.1) | 82.5 | (1.1) | 79.4 | (1.5) | 80.3 | (1.2) |
| Russian Federation | 0.27 | (0.03) | 78.1 | (0.9) | 84.0 | (0.9) | 81.5 | (1.0) | 81.2 | (0.8) | 84.9 | (0.8) |
| Thailand | -0.15 | (0.02) | 77.8 | (0.9) | 73.3 | (0.9) | 68.2 | (1.0) | 76.6 | (0.9) | 72.1 | (1.0) |
| Tunisia | -0.22 | (0.02) | 74.3 | (0.7) | 63.3 | (1.1) | 63.6 | (1.2) | 67.4 | (0.9) | 48.4 | (1.0) |
| Uruguay | -0.18 | (0.02) | 67.9 | (1.0) | 62.6 | (1.3) | 68.0 | (1.0) | 76.0 | (1.0) | 68.9 | (1.0) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of disciplinary climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink (ailा
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of disciplinary climate |  | Percentage of students reporting that the following phenomena occur "never or hardly ever" or "some lessons" in their mathematics lessons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students don't listen to what the teacher says | There is noise and disorder |  | The teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down |  | Students cannot work well |  | Student don't start working for a long time after the lessons begins |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.14 | (0.02) | 61.6 | (0.7) | 56.9 | (0.7) | 68.2 | (0.7) | 77.7 | (0.6) | 72.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Austria | 0.21 | (0.03) | 73.2 | (1.0) | 74.9 | (1.1) | 72.4 | (1.2) | 78.2 | (1.0) | 73.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Belgium | 0.04 | (0.03) | 72.3 | (0.8) | 66.5 | (1.0) | 70.9 | (1.0) | 81.1 | (0.8) | 70.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Canada | 0.01 | (0.01) | 71.2 | (0.6) | 65.8 | (0.7) | 74.9 | (0.6) | 81.5 | (0.5) | 71.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.10 | (0.04) | 63.5 | (1.4) | 70.1 | (1.4) | 73.2 | (1.2) | 80.1 | (1.1) | 77.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Denmark | -0.01 | (0.03) | 69.9 | (0.9) | 66.8 | (1.1) | 77.1 | (1.0) | 81.9 | (0.9) | 75.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Finland | -0.33 | (0.02) | 57.4 | (1.0) | 50.9 | (1.1) | 64.5 | (1.2) | 77.9 | (0.8) | 65.0 | (1.0) |
|  | France | -0.29 | (0.03) | 59.7 | (1.1) | 51.9 | (1.1) | 60.6 | (1.0) | 69.5 | (1.0) | 57.8 | (1.1) |
|  | Germany | -0.02 | (0.02) | 64.4 | (1.1) | 70.8 | (1.0) | 68.0 | (1.1) | 73.0 | (1.0) | 70.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Greece | -0.24 | (0.03) | 59.2 | (1.3) | 61.4 | (1.4) | 67.7 | (1.4) | 66.4 | (1.1) | 67.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Hungary | 0.05 | (0.04) | 64.4 | (1.4) | 71.8 | (1.4) | 72.6 | (1.4) | 77.5 | (1.1) | 79.8 | (1.3) |
|  | Iceland | -0.03 | (0.02) | 75.3 | (0.8) | 65.6 | (0.8) | 75.3 | (0.9) | 82.6 | (0.7) | 77.1 | (0.8) |
|  | Ireland | 0.13 | (0.03) | 63.6 | (1.2) | 69.2 | (1.3) | 75.1 | (1.1) | 81.0 | (1.0) | 77.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Italy | -0.04 | (0.02) | 67.0 | (0.7) | 63.9 | (0.7) | 69.1 | (0.7) | 73.1 | (0.6) | 73.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Japan | 0.67 | (0.03) | 90.5 | (0.6) | 89.9 | (0.7) | 92.8 | (0.6) | 83.7 | (0.9) | 90.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Korea | 0.19 | (0.03) | 81.2 | (1.0) | 69.7 | (1.1) | 83.5 | (0.8) | 85.1 | (0.9) | 81.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.02 | (0.02) | 64.3 | (0.8) | 68.5 | (0.8) | 69.8 | (0.9) | 72.7 | (0.8) | 66.9 | (0.8) |
|  | Mexico | 0.06 | (0.01) | 71.1 | (0.5) | 72.6 | (0.5) | 79.0 | (0.4) | 79.0 | (0.4) | 73.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.16 | (0.03) | 71.1 | (1.2) | 63.3 | (1.3) | 66.1 | (1.5) | 79.7 | (1.0) | 56.5 | (1.2) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.25 | (0.03) | 57.2 | (1.2) | 55.4 | (1.2) | 65.5 | (1.1) | 75.0 | (0.9) | 68.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Norway | -0.08 | (0.03) | 72.0 | (1.0) | 70.7 | (1.1) | 75.9 | (1.2) | 78.8 | (1.1) | 71.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Poland | 0.08 | (0.04) | 63.1 | (1.5) | 74.3 | (1.5) | 74.6 | (1.4) | 78.1 | (1.3) | 78.3 | (1.2) |
|  | Portugal | 0.00 | (0.03) | 67.5 | (1.2) | 68.0 | (1.2) | 73.3 | (1.1) | 78.2 | (1.0) | 74.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.13 | (0.03) | 60.9 | (1.0) | 71.0 | (1.1) | 68.2 | (1.2) | 73.8 | (1.0) | 69.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Spain | -0.04 | (0.02) | 65.7 | (0.8) | 68.3 | (0.9) | 66.6 | (1.1) | 77.4 | (0.7) | 69.7 | (0.8) |
|  | Sweden | -0.20 | (0.03) | 65.7 | (1.2) | 61.9 | (1.2) | 65.8 | (1.3) | 74.6 | (0.9) | 67.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.07 | (0.03) | 72.3 | (0.9) | 69.3 | (1.2) | 74.7 | (1.1) | 79.0 | (0.8) | 72.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Turkey | -0.09 | (0.02) | 75.5 | (1.0) | 74.6 | (1.0) | 72.1 | (0.9) | 67.9 | (0.9) | 70.6 | (0.9) |
|  | United States | 0.06 | (0.03) | 66.6 | (1.1) | 69.8 | (1.0) | 75.6 | (1.1) | 82.2 | (1.0) | 77.9 | (0.9) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.01 | (0.00) | 67.8 | (0.2) | 67.4 | (0.2) | 72.2 | (0.2) | 77.5 | (0.2) | 72.4 | (0.2) |
|  | Brazil | -0.34 | (0.02) | 58.2 | (0.8) | 58.5 | (0.8) | 62.4 | (0.9) | 67.9 | (0.7) | 55.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.29 | (0.02) | 79.6 | (0.8) | 81.3 | (0.9) | 85.7 | (0.8) | 84.8 | (0.7) | 82.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.12 | (0.02) | 83.2 | (0.8) | 74.5 | (1.0) | 74.9 | (1.0) | 84.4 | (0.8) | 84.3 | (0.8) |
|  | Latvia | 0.08 | (0.04) | 64.3 | (1.5) | 72.8 | (1.5) | 75.9 | (1.4) | 78.4 | (1.3) | 82.6 | (1.1) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.25 | (0.07) | 75.5 | (3.1) | 75.4 | (2.9) | 79.0 | (3.0) | 80.3 | (2.9) | 79.8 | (2.8) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.10 | (0.01) | 75.6 | (0.7) | 84.5 | (0.6) | 85.4 | (0.6) | 84.2 | (0.6) | 79.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.35 | (0.03) | 73.1 | (1.1) | 81.6 | (1.0) | 81.3 | (1.0) | 82.7 | (0.8) | 86.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Thailand | 0.07 | (0.02) | 84.5 | (0.7) | 73.9 | (0.9) | 77.8 | (0.8) | 84.6 | (0.8) | 84.6 | (0.8) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.43 | (0.02) | 64.3 | (1.0) | 52.9 | (1.3) | 59.6 | (1.0) | 59.0 | (1.3) | 49.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.16 | (0.03) | 66.0 | (1.0) | 62.5 | (1.2) | 60.0 | (1.3) | 75.6 | (0.9) | 71.7 | (1.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of disciplinary climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in disciplinary climate
Table IV.5.18 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of disciplinary climate |  | Percentage of students reporting that the following phenomena occur "never or hardly ever" or "some lessons" in their mathematics lessons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students don't listen to what the teacher says | There is noise and disorder |  | The teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down |  | Students cannot work well |  | Student don't start working for a long time after the lessons begins |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | 0.03 | (0.02) | -4.9 | (1.0) | -1.3 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (1.0) | -2.6 | (0.9) | -0.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Austria | 0.18 | (0.04) | 4.1 | (1.4) | 2.1 | (1.6) | 5.4 | (1.7) | 4.9 | (1.4) | 4.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Belgium | 0.16 | (0.03) | -0.1 | (1.1) | 4.0 | (1.4) | 5.0 | (1.3) | 0.6 | (1.0) | 4.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Canada | 0.15 | (0.02) | 0.0 | (0.8) | 4.6 | (0.9) | 2.7 | (0.8) | -0.7 | (0.6) | 2.8 | (0.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.26 | (0.05) | -0.5 | (1.8) | 3.8 | (2.0) | 6.8 | (1.8) | 4.8 | (1.4) | 2.0 | (1.4) |
|  | Denmark | 0.21 | (0.03) | 2.0 | (1.3) | 10.0 | (1.7) | 4.6 | (1.6) | 1.6 | (1.3) | 2.3 | (1.3) |
|  | Finland | -0.04 | (0.03) | -6.4 | (1.3) | -0.9 | (1.6) | -0.7 | (1.6) | -3.3 | (1.0) | -3.0 | (1.4) |
|  | France | -0.03 | (0.04) | -7.2 | (1.4) | -2.6 | (1.5) | -1.4 | (1.5) | -5.5 | (1.3) | -0.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Germany | -0.13 | (0.03) | -13.5 | (1.4) | -3.9 | (1.4) | -0.5 | (1.5) | -1.5 | (1.2) | -3.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Greece | 0.10 | (0.04) | -5.8 | (1.8) | 4.4 | (2.0) | 3.0 | (1.9) | -4.8 | (1.6) | 6.6 | (1.4) |
|  | Hungary | 0.06 | (0.04) | -7.9 | (1.8) | 0.3 | (1.7) | 2.4 | (1.9) | -0.2 | (1.3) | -1.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.26 | (0.02) | 5.9 | (1.1) | 6.3 | (1.1) | 11.4 | (1.2) | 7.8 | (1.0) | 3.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.05 | (0.04) | -4.2 | (1.5) | 0.9 | (1.7) | 0.5 | (1.5) | 0.1 | (1.3) | -1.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Italy | 0.20 | (0.03) | 3.7 | (1.2) | 5.6 | (1.4) | 7.7 | (1.3) | -2.0 | (1.2) | 5.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Japan | 0.44 | (0.04) | 9.7 | (1.1) | 6.8 | (1.2) | 6.5 | (1.0) | 8.5 | (1.3) | 6.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Korea | 0.23 | (0.03) | 8.6 | (1.3) | 69.7 | c | 2.4 | (1.0) | 3.1 | (1.1) | 2.0 | (1.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.31 | (0.02) | -0.5 | (1.1) | 16.9 | (1.1) | 12.7 | (1.2) | 12.0 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (1.1) |
|  | Mexico | 0.21 | (0.02) | -0.4 | (0.8) | -0.6 | (0.9) | 5.3 | (1.0) | 2.9 | (0.8) | 8.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.10 | (0.04) | -1.6 | (1.6) | 4.9 | (1.9) | 2.4 | (2.0) | -1.2 | (1.4) | -5.0 | (1.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.05 | (0.03) | -4.4 | (1.4) | 2.8 | (1.5) | 2.6 | (1.4) | -2.2 | (1.1) | 0.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Norway | 0.28 | (0.03) | 6.1 | (1.4) | 11.9 | (1.6) | 11.8 | (1.6) | 7.0 | (1.5) | 7.5 | (1.6) |
|  | Poland | 0.14 | (0.05) | -3.8 | (1.9) | 1.2 | (2.0) | 4.9 | (1.9) | -0.5 | (1.6) | 0.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Portugal | 0.15 | (0.03) | -4.3 | (1.5) | 3.1 | (1.7) | 3.5 | (1.5) | 0.6 | (1.4) | 1.3 | (1.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.10 | (0.03) | -0.1 | (1.3) | 5.2 | (1.4) | 2.3 | (1.5) | -1.0 | (1.3) | -2.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Spain | 0.14 | (0.04) | -4.7 | (1.3) | 3.4 | (1.5) | 2.3 | (1.6) | 1.3 | (1.2) | 4.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Sweden | -0.01 | (0.04) | -8.5 | (1.5) | -2.2 | (1.7) | -1.5 | (1.7) | -5.4 | (1.3) | -3.8 | (1.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.14 | (0.04) | -0.1 | (1.3) | 1.9 | (1.6) | 7.0 | (1.5) | 4.9 | (1.2) | 3.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 0.17 | (0.03) | -0.6 | (1.5) | 7.3 | (1.5) | 7.5 | (1.4) | -1.2 | (1.5) | 1.6 | (1.6) |
|  | United States | 0.11 | (0.04) | -1.4 | (1.4) | 3.8 | (1.3) | 1.7 | (1.3) | 1.1 | (1.2) | 4.7 | (1.2) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.14 | (0.01) | -1.4 | (0.3) | 5.8 | (0.3) | 4.1 | (0.3) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毕 } \\ & \text { 年 } \end{aligned}$ | Brazil | 0.11 | (0.03) | -7.2 | (1.3) | -3.5 | (1.3) | 0.6 | (1.4) | -2.3 | (1.1) | 18.8 | (1.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.31 | (0.03) | 0.1 | (1.2) | -1.4 | (1.2) | 4.6 | (1.2) | 4.3 | (1.1) | 2.6 | (1.2) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.22 | (0.03) | 8.4 | (1.2) | 6.8 | (1.3) | 12.4 | (1.5) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 14.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Latvia | -0.03 | (0.05) | -9.1 | (1.8) | -7.2 | (1.9) | -3.6 | (1.7) | -3.3 | (1.7) | 3.2 | (1.6) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.20 | (0.09) | 1.7 | (4.0) | 3.2 | (3.6) | 12.0 | (3.9) | 8.5 | (3.7) | 4.8 | (3.5) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.17 | (0.02) | -6.0 | (1.5) | 0.0 | (1.3) | 2.9 | (1.3) | 4.8 | (1.6) | -1.3 | (1.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.08 | (0.05) | -5.0 | (1.4) | -2.4 | (1.4) | -0.3 | (1.4) | 1.6 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (1.1) |
|  | Thailand | 0.22 | (0.03) | 6.8 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (1.2) | 9.6 | (1.3) | 8.0 | (1.2) | 12.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.21 | (0.03) | -9.9 | (1.2) | -10.4 | (1.7) | -4.0 | (1.6) | -8.4 | (1.5) | 1.2 | (1.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.02 | (0.03) | -1.9 | (1.5) | -0.1 | (1.8) | -8.0 | (1.6) | -0.4 | (1.3) | 2.8 | (1.5) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of disciplinary climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink (ailा
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following phenomena hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Teachers' low expectations of students | Teachers not meeting individual students' needs |  | Teacher absenteeism |  | Staff resistingchange |  | Teacher being too strict with students |  | Students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential |  | Poor teacherstudent relations |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.15 | (0.03) | 80.6 | (1.4) | 65.0 | (1.8) | 87.4 | (1.4) | 63.5 | (2.0) | 93.9 | (0.9) | 84.7 | (1.4) | 91.2 | (1.0) |
|  | Austria | -0.16 | (0.07) | 85.1 | (3.0) | 80.6 | (3.3) | 80.3 | (3.1) | 73.0 | (3.4) | 88.4 | (2.6) | 85.5 | (2.9) | 93.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Belgium | -0.26 | (0.05) | 91.5 | (1.6) | 84.1 | (2.4) | 75.0 | (2.7) | 65.7 | (3.0) | 85.7 | (2.1) | 81.6 | (2.2) | 96.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Canada | 0.10 | (0.04) | 94.3 | (1.3) | 78.1 | (1.9) | 91.0 | (1.5) | 65.7 | (2.5) | 92.0 | (1.4) | 89.8 | (1.5) | 94.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.19 | (0.05) | 93.2 | (2.0) | 96.3 | (1.4) | 90.7 | (2.7) | 93.4 | (1.7) | 90.8 | (1.9) | 81.6 | (2.8) | 96.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Denmark | 0.13 | (0.06) | 91.2 | (2.1) | 85.8 | (2.6) | 84.7 | (2.7) | 83.5 | (2.9) | 98.8 | (0.6) | 86.2 | (2.6) | 97.0 | (1.1) |
|  | Finland | -0.08 | (0.05) | 96.8 | (0.8) | 80.5 | (3.1) | 82.7 | (3.0) | 77.7 | (3.1) | 95.5 | (1.0) | 92.8 | (1.4) | 95.1 | (1.3) |
|  | France | -0.17 | (0.06) | 92.4 | (1.6) | 65.8 | (2.8) | 91.3 | (1.8) | 57.9 | (3.4) | 76.8 | (2.8) | 78.1 | (2.8) | 92.1 | (1.8) |
|  | Germany | -0.31 | (0.05) | 91.7 | (2.0) | 84.5 | (2.8) | 70.3 | (3.5) | 75.5 | (2.9) | 92.9 | (1.9) | 86.8 | (2.3) | 97.9 | (1.0) |
|  | Greece | -0.16 | (0.09) | 69.5 | (3.4) | 79.5 | (3.0) | 88.4 | (2.6) | 77.2 | (3.1) | 87.0 | (2.4) | 74.3 | (3.1) | 85.4 | (3.1) |
|  | Hungary | 0.37 | (0.07) | 96.3 | (1.5) | 86.2 | (2.4) | 99.5 | (0.5) | 95.4 | (1.7) | 91.7 | (2.1) | 71.2 | (3.5) | 93.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Iceland | 0.05 | (0.01) | 91.5 | (0.1) | 75.5 | (0.2) | 85.3 | (0.2) | 69.1 | (0.2) | 96.9 | (0.1) | 85.7 | (0.2) | 98.5 | (0.0) |
|  | Ireland | 0.10 | (0.08) | 86.3 | (2.8) | 82.1 | (3.0) | 88.3 | (2.7) | 81.3 | (3.3) | 88.5 | (2.8) | 86.7 | (2.9) | 98.1 | (1.3) |
|  | Italy | -0.29 | (0.04) | 78.7 | (2.1) | 75.7 | (2.0) | 88.9 | (1.7) | 46.7 | (2.1) | 79.6 | (1.7) | 72.1 | (2.4) | 74.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Japan | -0.31 | (0.06) | 79.7 | (3.0) | 73.9 | (3.3) | 97.0 | (1.2) | 68.9 | (3.5) | 81.3 | (2.7) | 71.6 | (3.2) | 90.4 | (2.1) |
|  | Korea | 0.04 | (0.10) | 75.3 | (3.8) | 73.8 | (3.1) | 99.1 | (0.9) | 86.3 | (2.9) | 83.9 | (3.4) | 79.8 | (3.6) | 86.4 | (3.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.29 | (0.00) | 95.8 | (0.0) | 83.3 | (0.1) | 93.6 | (0.1) | 79.9 | (0.1) | 91.4 | (0.0) | 78.7 | (0.1) | 92.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | -0.27 | (0.04) | 74.1 | (2.0) | 74.6 | (1.9) | 82.6 | (1.4) | 64.6 | (1.7) | 77.5 | (1.6) | 60.9 | (1.9) | 94.0 | (0.9) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.85 | (0.04) | 75.4 | (3.5) | 28.7 | (3.8) | 59.8 | (4.0) | 54.1 | (4.6) | 89.0 | (2.4) | 35.5 | (3.7) | 93.3 | (1.7) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.16 | (0.07) | 85.7 | (2.7) | 66.9 | (4.2) | 92.6 | (2.4) | 73.3 | (3.9) | 97.2 | (1.7) | 91.5 | (2.5) | 96.0 | (1.6) |
|  | Norway | -0.45 | (0.06) | 81.6 | (3.3) | 56.2 | (4.0) | 70.0 | (3.6) | 74.5 | (3.4) | 98.7 | (1.0) | 75.2 | (3.1) | 90.3 | (1.9) |
|  | Poland | 0.47 | (0.06) | 95.8 | (1.5) | 90.3 | (2.3) | 93.0 | (2.2) | 89.2 | (2.4) | 96.6 | (1.1) | 92.8 | (2.1) | 98.6 | (1.0) |
|  | Portugal | 0.11 | (0.09) | 82.7 | (3.8) | 87.9 | (3.4) | 97.8 | (1.7) | 81.7 | (3.7) | 97.5 | (1.5) | 76.4 | (3.4) | 96.8 | (2.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.04 | (0.06) | 87.8 | (2.3) | 92.0 | (1.9) | 92.0 | (2.1) | 84.1 | (3.2) | 76.1 | (3.1) | 78.8 | (3.1) | 97.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Spain | -0.19 | (0.05) | 77.9 | (2.2) | 75.9 | (2.0) | 95.3 | (0.8) | 68.1 | (2.5) | 85.4 | (1.8) | 71.0 | (2.4) | 93.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Sweden | -0.09 | (0.07) | 81.2 | (3.0) | 74.5 | (3.3) | 79.1 | (2.7) | 79.1 | (3.4) | 97.3 | (1.0) | 79.0 | (2.8) | 93.3 | (1.6) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.01 | (0.05) | 95.9 | (1.5) | 87.2 | (2.4) | 94.6 | (1.7) | 75.4 | (3.2) | 93.6 | (1.6) | 89.4 | (2.2) | 97.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Turkey | -0.23 | (0.08) | 67.8 | (3.4) | 46.5 | (4.3) | 89.0 | (2.5) | 75.9 | (3.2) | 93.5 | (2.3) | 68.0 | (3.4) | 82.2 | (3.2) |
|  | United States | 0.13 | (0.10) | 83.4 | (3.3) | 75.9 | (3.9) | 90.6 | (2.4) | 71.9 | (4.1) | 94.6 | (2.1) | 89.0 | (2.5) | 94.3 | (1.8) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.09 | (0.01) | 85.2 | (0.5) | 76.5 | (0.5) | 87.1 | (0.4) | 74.8 | (0.6) | 90.5 | (0.4) | 79.2 | (0.5) | 93.2 | (0.3) |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { ¿ } \\ & \text { ¿ } \end{aligned}$ | Brazil | -0.33 | (0.06) | 60.8 | (2.8) | 59.4 | (2.5) | 66.5 | (2.5) | 63.9 | (2.8) | 83.2 | (2.2) | 63.0 | (2.5) | 81.4 | (1.8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.37 | (0.07) | 69.6 | (3.3) | 55.2 | (4.0) | 88.8 | (2.6) | 81.5 | (3.0) | 94.1 | (2.0) | 63.3 | (4.1) | 95.5 | (1.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.30 | (0.08) | 94.1 | (1.8) | 97.2 | (1.3) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 97.6 | (1.3) | 96.3 | (1.6) | 58.5 | (3.7) | 99.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Latvia | 0.13 | (0.07) | 85.9 | (2.8) | 87.0 | (2.5) | 94.7 | (1.6) | 90.7 | (2.3) | 91.0 | (2.3) | 82.5 | (3.0) | 93.4 | (1.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.12 | (0.01) | 100.0 | c | 93.3 | (0.6) | 87.8 | (1.0) | 74.4 | (1.2) | 93.3 | (0.6) | 100.0 | c | 93.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Macao-China | -0.09 | (0.00) | 78.1 | (0.0) | 56.7 | (0.1) | 84.1 | (0.0) | 81.9 | (0.0) | 84.4 | (0.0) | 61.6 | (0.1) | 83.3 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.27 | (0.08) | 68.2 | (2.8) | 63.5 | (3.8) | 74.1 | (3.1) | 65.0 | (3.3) | 75.7 | (3.2) | 45.2 | (3.5) | 80.1 | (2.4) |
|  | Thailand | -0.08 | (0.07) | 86.7 | (2.7) | 85.8 | (2.5) | 89.1 | (2.5) | 88.7 | (2.4) | 66.5 | (3.9) | 92.6 | (1.9) | 97.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.70 | (0.07) | 59.4 | (4.1) | 65.8 | (4.0) | 36.1 | (3.7) | 61.0 | (4.5) | 70.9 | (3.6) | 40.7 | (3.8) | 75.9 | (3.6) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.67 | (0.06) | 63.0 | (3.7) | 63.4 | (3.3) | 35.1 | (3.0) | 65.8 | (3.6) | 89.4 | (2.2) | 44.9 | (3.4) | 86.2 | (2.4) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003
results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 ) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink (intsh http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
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Table IV.5.19 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following phenomena hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Teachers' low expectations of students | Teachers not meeting individual students' needs |  | Teacher absenteeism |  | Staff resistingchange |  | Teacher being too strict with students |  | Students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential |  | Poor teacherstudent relations |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  | 0.33 | (0.06) | 12.1 | (3.1) | 13.1 | (3.7) | 3.3 | (2.6) | -2.4 | (3.6) | 1.4 | (1.8) | 3.3 | (2.7) | 5.8 | (2.2) |
|  | Austria | -0.09 | (0.11) | 0.8 | (4.6) | 2.0 | (4.4) | -5.7 | (4.3) | -10.5 | (4.4) | -4.5 | (3.3) | 7.5 | (4.6) | 3.3 | (3.0) |
|  | Belgium | -0.25 | (0.07) | -0.3 | (2.3) | 5.8 | (3.9) | -2.8 | (3.8) | -7.7 | (4.0) | -11.2 | (2.4) | -3.4 | (3.2) | 5.7 | (1.9) |
|  | Canada | 0.39 | (0.06) | 5.1 | (2.0) | 10.9 | (3.2) | -0.9 | (2.0) | -1.5 | (3.3) | 0.4 | (1.9) | 5.7 | (2.3) | 7.1 | (1.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.32 | (0.07) | 2.0 | (2.7) | 9.4 | (2.5) | 13.4 | (3.7) | 3.6 | (2.8) | 0.7 | (2.7) | 2.0 | (3.9) | 3.0 | (2.2) |
|  | Denmark | 0.00 | (0.09) | 0.3 | (2.9) | 4.7 | (3.7) | -1.3 | (3.7) | -0.4 | (4.0) | 1.4 | (1.2) | -6.9 | (3.3) | 2.0 | (2.0) |
|  | Finland | 0.17 | (0.08) | 3.5 | (2.0) | 15.1 | (4.7) | 3.1 | (4.4) | -8.9 | (3.9) | 1.3 | (1.9) | 9.1 | (3.5) | 9.0 | (2.9) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 0.05 | (0.08) | 1.3 | (2.9) | 15.6 | (4.4) | -6.5 | (4.8) | 0.0 | (4.3) | -4.2 | (2.3) | 9.8 | (4.0) | 11.7 | (2.7) |
|  | Greece | 0.45 | (0.24) | 14.7 | (6.1) | 22.6 | (6.7) | 28.3 | (6.2) | 8.6 | (5.8) | 10.4 | (5.6) | 3.4 | (6.2) | 26.2 | (6.4) |
|  | Hungary | 0.28 | (0.11) | 5.5 | (3.0) | 9.1 | (4.3) | 20.9 | (3.5) | -0.1 | (2.1) | 3.7 | (3.5) | -6.1 | (5.2) | 9.8 | (4.0) |
|  | Iceland | 0.02 | (0.01) | 5.9 | (0.2) | 14.9 | (0.3) | 17.5 | (0.3) | -18.0 | (0.3) | -1.8 | (0.1) | -3.0 | (0.2) | 6.7 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.58 | (0.11) | 15.8 | (4.9) | 29.5 | (5.7) | 18.1 | (4.9) | 9.1 | (5.1) | -2.8 | (3.7) | 7.6 | (4.7) | 13.6 | (3.7) |
|  | Italy | -0.04 | (0.09) | -8.9 | (3.1) | 3.7 | (3.8) | -0.6 | (2.8) | -16.7 | (4.1) | -7.0 | (3.1) | -3.2 | (4.0) | 8.8 | (3.7) |
|  | Japan | 0.22 | (0.09) | 11.4 | (4.7) | 7.8 | (5.3) | 0.7 | (2.1) | 10.4 | (5.6) | 1.9 | (4.5) | 8.7 | (5.1) | 13.8 | (4.0) |
|  | Korea | -0.04 | (0.15) | 7.3 | (5.5) | 1.8 | (4.5) | 10.1 | (3.0) | 3.6 | (4.3) | -8.5 | (4.1) | 6.8 | (5.4) | 0.5 | (4.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.36 | (0.00) | 4.6 | (0.0) | 39.5 | (0.1) | -1.5 | (0.1) | -1.2 | (0.1) | 5.2 | (0.1) | 15.5 | (0.1) | 21.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 0.30 | (0.10) | 14.8 | (4.1) | 9.8 | (3.7) | 9.1 | (3.4) | 5.0 | (3.8) | 4.8 | (3.5) | 6.5 | (4.1) | 17.7 | (3.0) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.16 | (0.07) | 14.3 | (6.0) | -15.5 | (6.2) | 5.4 | (5.6) | 14.2 | (6.5) | 7.2 | (4.3) | -24.1 | (5.7) | 13.4 | (3.9) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.32 | (0.08) | 25.4 | (4.2) | 13.0 | (5.4) | 0.5 | (3.0) | -3.3 | (5.1) | 3.4 | (2.5) | 15.3 | (3.8) | 13.6 | (3.3) |
|  | Norway | 0.22 | (0.08) | 2.0 | (4.6) | 27.8 | (5.6) | -5.6 | (5.0) | 9.5 | (5.0) | 2.2 | (1.8) | -1.1 | (4.6) | 12.6 | (3.9) |
|  | Poland | 0.39 | (0.11) | 7.9 | (3.1) | 9.2 | (3.8) | 3.2 | (3.3) | -0.9 | (3.4) | 1.5 | (2.1) | 11.3 | (4.0) | 8.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Portugal | 0.80 | (0.11) | 27.2 | (5.9) | 32.5 | (5.6) | 27.3 | (4.4) | 25.3 | (6.0) | -0.5 | (1.9) | 11.4 | (5.5) | 12.7 | (3.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.18 | (0.08) | 4.8 | (3.7) | 2.3 | (2.6) | 10.9 | (3.6) | -8.4 | (3.6) | -18.0 | (3.3) | -9.1 | (3.9) | 4.5 | (2.3) |
|  | Spain | -0.19 | (0.10) | -1.0 | (3.8) | -3.5 | (3.9) | 8.0 | (2.8) | -5.3 | (4.2) | -7.7 | (2.7) | -8.0 | (3.5) | 3.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Sweden | 0.10 | (0.09) | -7.3 | (3.9) | 7.0 | (4.7) | -5.2 | (3.9) | 10.5 | (4.8) | -0.5 | (1.5) | -5.0 | (4.1) | 4.2 | (2.8) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.08 | (0.08) | 3.7 | (2.3) | 7.8 | (3.7) | -0.6 | (2.2) | -2.0 | (4.5) | -3.6 | (1.8) | 0.9 | (3.1) | 8.7 | (2.2) |
|  | Turkey | 0.91 | (0.16) | 28.6 | (5.8) | -7.2 | (5.9) | 26.4 | (4.7) | 22.3 | (5.6) | 27.8 | (5.1) | 30.5 | (5.8) | 40.3 | (5.7) |
|  | United States | 0.48 | (0.11) | 7.8 | (4.7) | 8.0 | (5.0) | 3.9 | (3.4) | 5.9 | (5.3) | -0.4 | (2.6) | 2.5 | (3.5) | 8.5 | (3.1) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.21 | (0.02) | 7.5 | (0.8) | 10.6 | (0.8) | 6.4 | (0.7) | 1.5 | (0.8) | 0.1 | (0.6) | 3.1 | (0.8) | 10.6 | (0.6) |


| N | Brazil | -0.23 | (0.12) | -11.7 | (4.4) | -13.7 | (4.3) | -6.5 | (4.3) | -12.0 | (4.2) | -3.9 | (3.4) | -9.3 | (4.2) | 0.5 | (3.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.30 | (0.12) | 12.9 | (5.2) | -1.1 | (5.6) | 9.7 | (4.4) | 12.6 | (4.6) | 13.7 | (4.0) | 3.2 | (5.4) | 19.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Indonesia | 2.76 | (0.14) | 69.2 | (3.3) | 72.8 | (3.4) | 75.8 | (3.3) | 58.6 | (3.8) | 68.1 | (4.0) | 32.7 | (4.8) | 72.4 | (4.0) |
|  | Latvia | 0.16 | (0.11) | -1.4 | (3.9) | 11.6 | (4.7) | 1.5 | (2.3) | 2.9 | (3.7) | -2.5 | (3.2) | 6.7 | (5.0) | 8.7 | (3.9) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.25 | (0.02) | 26.6 | C | 19.6 | (0.7) | -12.2 | c | 28.0 | (1.3) | -6.7 | c | 5.6 | C | 3.9 | (0.7) |
|  | Macao-China | 1.09 | (0.01) | 37.3 | (0.3) | 16.9 | (0.2) | 21.6 | (0.3) | 29.8 | (0.3) | 29.5 | (0.2) | 17.6 | (0.3) | 27.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.71 | (0.13) | 20.6 | (5.2) | 3.4 | (5.2) | 25.3 | (5.2) | 3.5 | (5.0) | 31.2 | (4.7) | -13.1 | (5.1) | 25.0 | (4.6) |
|  | Thailand | 0.22 | (0.12) | 24.7 | (4.8) | 22.3 | (4.7) | 0.9 | (3.8) | -1.5 | (3.3) | -7.7 | (5.5) | 9.7 | (3.7) | 10.3 | (2.9) |
|  | Tunisia | 0.96 | (0.10) | 43.3 | (5.1) | 40.4 | (5.4) | 9.8 | (5.0) | 6.5 | (6.0) | 16.0 | (5.7) | 0.4 | (5.3) | 42.1 | (5.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.11 | (0.12) | 12.7 | (5.7) | -3.0 | (5.4) | -0.8 | (4.4) | 6.6 | (5.2) | 10.0 | (4.6) | -8.3 | (5.9) | 8.0 | (4.3) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003
results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 ) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of student-related factors affecting school climate |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following phenomena hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students skipping classes | Students lacking respect for teachers |  | Disruption of classes by students |  | Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs |  | Students intimidating or bullying other students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.27 | (0.05) | 80.2 | (2.2) | 78.2 | (2.4) | 62.9 | (3.0) | 94.2 | (1.3) | 76.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Austria | -0.27 | (0.06) | 57.5 | (3.8) | 82.9 | (3.1) | 61.6 | (4.2) | 91.4 | (2.2) | 85.2 | (2.5) |
|  | Belgium | 0.14 | (0.07) | 78.8 | (2.4) | 82.4 | (2.3) | 73.7 | (2.4) | 92.7 | (1.9) | 85.9 | (2.4) |
|  | Canada | -0.68 | (0.04) | 42.4 | (2.4) | 75.2 | (2.4) | 66.0 | (2.7) | 68.0 | (2.1) | 81.9 | (2.0) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.07 | (0.05) | 75.8 | (2.8) | 83.6 | (2.4) | 63.8 | (2.9) | 98.1 | (0.9) | 97.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Denmark | 0.01 | (0.05) | 85.6 | (2.3) | 87.5 | (2.3) | 58.3 | (3.2) | 99.2 | (0.6) | 93.1 | (1.7) |
|  | Finland | -0.37 | (0.05) | 65.9 | (3.8) | 87.6 | (2.5) | 61.5 | (3.8) | 96.2 | (1.6) | 92.6 | (2.0) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
|  | Germany | -0.33 | (0.06) | 74.6 | (3.1) | 77.8 | (3.2) | 49.3 | (3.5) | 91.0 | (1.8) | 76.0 | (2.9) |
|  | Greece | -0.57 | (0.18) | 53.5 | (5.2) | 52.7 | (5.4) | 47.9 | (5.9) | 68.7 | (5.7) | 76.6 | (5.3) |
|  | Hungary | 0.09 | (0.08) | 74.0 | (3.9) | 86.0 | (3.2) | 58.4 | (3.8) | 94.3 | (2.0) | 91.8 | (2.3) |
|  | Iceland | -0.19 | (0.00) | 72.2 | (0.2) | 77.9 | (0.2) | 38.0 | (0.2) | 94.8 | (0.1) | 75.4 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | -0.54 | (0.09) | 78.6 | (3.8) | 77.2 | (4.2) | 53.2 | (4.2) | 75.9 | (4.0) | 79.2 | (3.6) |
|  | Italy | -0.25 | (0.06) | 36.7 | (3.2) | 83.0 | (2.8) | 59.2 | (3.3) | 99.3 | (0.3) | 92.2 | (1.7) |
|  | Japan | 0.23 | (0.07) | 77.5 | (3.0) | 68.3 | (3.2) | 87.4 | (2.6) | 99.3 | (0.7) | 92.7 | (2.3) |
|  | Korea | 0.76 | (0.13) | 87.1 | (2.9) | 76.6 | (3.6) | 82.2 | (3.1) | 86.9 | (3.2) | 86.5 | (3.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.40 | (0.00) | 74.9 | (0.1) | 84.2 | (0.1) | 54.8 | (0.1) | 91.3 | (0.0) | 84.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Mexico | -0.01 | (0.07) | 67.7 | (3.4) | 86.5 | (1.8) | 73.3 | (3.3) | 92.2 | (1.1) | 76.0 | (3.2) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.45 | (0.07) | 69.9 | (4.0) | 71.6 | (4.3) | 56.7 | (4.3) | 92.9 | (2.9) | 78.2 | (3.9) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.65 | (0.04) | 62.0 | (2.9) | 75.6 | (3.1) | 58.7 | (3.0) | 79.9 | (2.4) | 85.0 | (2.6) |
|  | Norway | -0.42 | (0.05) | 79.7 | (3.0) | 64.5 | (3.8) | 26.2 | (3.6) | 96.6 | (1.4) | 87.8 | (2.7) |
|  | Poland | -0.30 | (0.06) | 55.4 | (3.6) | 79.2 | (3.2) | 60.1 | (4.2) | 90.4 | (2.3) | 92.5 | (2.2) |
|  | Portugal | -0.38 | (0.07) | 50.0 | (4.0) | 84.0 | (3.0) | 65.4 | (4.1) | 97.3 | (1.3) | 90.7 | (2.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.01 | (0.05) | c | c | 87.6 | (1.9) | 60.1 | (3.6) | 96.1 | (1.8) | 94.9 | (1.3) |
|  | Spain | -0.26 | (0.07) | 61.6 | (3.2) | 66.2 | (3.4) | 40.7 | (2.9) | 95.3 | (1.4) | 86.8 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | -0.35 | (0.05) | 71.8 | (3.3) | 74.8 | (3.4) | 49.6 | (3.8) | 95.4 | (1.6) | 83.4 | (2.6) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.26 | (0.08) | 89.3 | (2.0) | 82.6 | (3.6) | 48.3 | (4.2) | 80.7 | (2.8) | 75.6 | (3.9) |
|  | Turkey | -0.56 | (0.14) | 55.4 | (4.6) | 62.9 | (5.0) | 54.3 | (4.9) | 77.7 | (3.9) | 68.0 | (4.7) |
|  | United States | -0.52 | (0.06) | 64.3 | (3.2) | 77.9 | (2.8) | 72.8 | (2.7) | 78.7 | (3.1) | 85.8 | (2.4) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.25 | (0.01) | 68.2 | (0.6) | 77.7 | (0.6) | 58.7 | (0.7) | 89.8 | (0.4) | 84.7 | (0.5) |


| n Brazil | -0.39 | (0.10) | 55.0 | (3.9) | 70.3 | (3.5) | 55.5 | (3.6) | 79.2 | (3.1) | 74.0 | (3.9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F Hong Kong-China | 0.17 | (0.13) | 79.2 | (3.4) | 72.2 | (3.5) | 68.7 | (3.7) | 82.2 | (3.3) | 75.2 | (3.3) |
| こ Indonesia | -1.90 | (0.13) | 27.8 | (3.6) | 31.5 | (3.5) | 21.1 | (3.6) | 32.6 | (4.0) | 36.2 | (3.8) |
| Latvia | -0.37 | (0.08) | 42.8 | (4.2) | 85.8 | (3.1) | 75.6 | (3.8) | 89.3 | (2.7) | 92.5 | (2.3) |
| Liechtenstein | -0.72 | (0.00) | 51.8 | (0.4) | 80.8 | (0.2) | 6.5 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 45.6 | (0.5) |
| Macao-China | -0.74 | (0.01) | 48.8 | (0.3) | 43.8 | (0.2) | 45.5 | (0.3) | 60.8 | (0.3) | 68.2 | (0.3) |
| Russian Federation | -1.25 | (0.11) | 14.1 | (2.5) | 51.2 | (4.0) | 58.6 | (3.7) | 58.7 | (4.3) | 59.3 | (4.0) |
| Thailand | 0.05 | (0.07) | 81.2 | (3.3) | 92.0 | (2.2) | 81.2 | (2.5) | 98.2 | (1.0) | 95.9 | (1.5) |
| Tunisia | -1.40 | (0.11) | 33.1 | (4.0) | 41.9 | (4.2) | 21.8 | (3.3) | 54.9 | (3.8) | 57.4 | (4.0) |
| Uruguay | 0.29 | (0.07) | 58.0 | (4.1) | 83.3 | (2.5) | 87.9 | (2.5) | 92.6 | (2.0) | 88.5 | (2.0) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of student-related factors affecting school climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 ) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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|  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of student-related factors affecting school climate |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following phenomena hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students skipping classes | Students lacking respect for teachers |  | Disruption of classes by students |  | Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs |  | Students intimidating or bullying other students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | -0.18 | (0.04) | 75.4 | (1.6) | 76.9 | (1.5) | 67.9 | (1.9) | 95.5 | (0.7) | 81.3 | (1.3) |
|  | Austria | -0.30 | (0.08) | 59.2 | (3.8) | 78.4 | (3.3) | 62.5 | (3.7) | 94.5 | (1.8) | 82.8 | (3.0) |
|  | Belgium | -0.08 | (0.06) | 79.9 | (2.2) | 82.0 | (2.5) | 69.5 | (2.4) | 94.3 | (1.5) | 85.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Canada | -0.47 | (0.04) | 43.2 | (2.5) | 89.2 | (1.5) | 81.2 | (2.1) | 79.6 | (1.9) | 84.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.20 | (0.06) | 60.2 | (3.8) | 83.9 | (2.8) | 66.4 | (3.5) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 94.9 | (1.9) |
|  | Denmark | 0.07 | (0.07) | 78.6 | (3.0) | 81.4 | (2.9) | 65.8 | (3.3) | 97.0 | (1.1) | 94.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Finland | -0.50 | (0.04) | 65.0 | (2.8) | 67.7 | (3.3) | 41.2 | (3.6) | 98.1 | (0.7) | 70.1 | (3.3) |
|  | France | 0.01 | (0.06) | 71.7 | (2.9) | 85.7 | (2.0) | 72.8 | (2.6) | 87.7 | (2.2) | 94.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Germany | -0.18 | (0.04) | 83.5 | (2.6) | 82.4 | (2.6) | 58.1 | (3.2) | 98.1 | (1.1) | 85.4 | (2.6) |
|  | Greece | 0.03 | (0.08) | 77.9 | (3.0) | 82.4 | (2.8) | 58.5 | (3.9) | 92.0 | (2.1) | 88.7 | (2.4) |
|  | Hungary | 0.13 | (0.05) | 78.5 | (2.6) | 82.7 | (2.3) | 71.9 | (2.8) | 93.4 | (1.9) | 94.2 | (1.6) |
|  | Iceland | 0.31 | (0.01) | 91.6 | (0.2) | 87.1 | (0.2) | 64.4 | (0.2) | 95.9 | (0.1) | 95.2 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | -0.09 | (0.06) | 85.4 | (3.0) | 80.6 | (3.0) | 77.0 | (3.0) | 88.9 | (2.6) | 85.8 | (3.0) |
|  | Italy | 0.01 | (0.04) | 63.4 | (2.1) | 84.3 | (1.5) | 65.9 | (2.1) | 97.0 | (0.7) | 94.4 | (1.2) |
|  | Japan | 0.31 | (0.07) | 90.0 | (1.9) | 82.2 | (2.7) | 94.8 | (1.7) | 98.5 | (0.8) | 95.7 | (1.5) |
|  | Korea | 0.07 | (0.09) | 85.3 | (2.9) | 61.7 | (3.8) | 69.4 | (3.5) | 93.1 | (1.9) | 79.6 | (3.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.27 | (0.00) | 88.4 | (0.1) | 84.1 | (0.1) | 59.5 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.0) | 89.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 0.01 | (0.03) | 67.3 | (1.9) | 89.6 | (1.3) | 87.4 | (1.3) | 90.7 | (1.2) | 86.8 | (1.3) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.40 | (0.05) | 70.6 | (3.3) | 77.6 | (3.8) | 62.9 | (4.2) | 88.9 | (2.6) | 76.4 | (2.8) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.25 | (0.06) | 67.1 | (3.5) | 87.9 | (2.7) | 77.1 | (3.2) | 93.3 | (2.3) | 88.4 | (2.4) |
|  | Norway | -0.12 | (0.05) | 70.2 | (3.2) | 72.3 | (3.2) | 50.4 | (3.7) | 100.0 | c | 91.3 | (2.3) |
|  | Poland | 0.05 | (0.06) | 59.8 | (4.1) | 83.6 | (3.3) | 70.0 | (3.9) | 99.3 | (0.6) | 93.3 | (2.1) |
|  | Portugal | -0.14 | (0.09) | 58.7 | (3.9) | 69.3 | (4.2) | 46.1 | (4.2) | 92.5 | (2.1) | 90.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.22 | (0.06) | 28.2 | (3.2) | 68.2 | (3.5) | 53.5 | (4.0) | 98.6 | (0.8) | 97.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Spain | 0.19 | (0.05) | 74.6 | (2.4) | 76.4 | (2.1) | 62.3 | (2.6) | 96.2 | (1.2) | 96.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Sweden | -0.19 | (0.05) | 59.9 | (3.7) | 77.6 | (3.2) | 66.0 | (3.4) | 95.3 | (1.7) | 89.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Switzerland | -0.04 | (0.06) | 82.5 | (2.8) | 84.5 | (2.4) | 60.5 | (3.7) | 91.2 | (2.0) | 91.6 | (1.7) |
|  | Turkey | -0.30 | (0.07) | 45.9 | (3.4) | 79.4 | (3.5) | 72.1 | (4.0) | 94.4 | (1.8) | 90.7 | (2.6) |
|  | United States | -0.14 | (0.08) | 69.0 | (3.7) | 84.7 | (3.0) | 83.9 | (3.3) | 82.6 | (3.1) | 88.0 | (2.7) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.09 | (0.01) | 70.0 | (0.6) | 79.9 | (0.5) | 66.7 | (0.6) | 94.1 | (0.3) | 88.7 | (0.4) |
| ~ | Brazil | -0.49 | (0.06) | 52.1 | (2.6) | 58.4 | (2.6) | 39.8 | (2.4) | 82.2 | (2.0) | 77.4 | (2.2) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.37 | (0.06) | 94.2 | (1.9) | 85.5 | (2.8) | 86.6 | (2.7) | 98.8 | (0.9) | 94.0 | (1.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 0.78 | (0.06) | 97.0 | (1.5) | 97.0 | (1.4) | 94.3 | (1.9) | 98.9 | (0.9) | 99.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Latvia | -0.19 | (0.06) | 58.8 | (3.3) | 79.5 | (3.1) | 69.4 | (3.6) | 95.7 | (1.5) | 97.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.12 | (0.02) | 92.9 | (0.8) | 86.7 | (0.9) | 38.2 | (0.8) | 93.3 | (0.6) | 94.5 | (0.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 0.53 | (0.00) | 93.1 | (0.0) | 79.4 | (0.0) | 76.5 | (0.0) | 89.5 | (0.0) | 83.2 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.19 | (0.11) | 29.7 | (3.0) | 65.4 | (2.8) | 75.9 | (3.2) | 79.7 | (3.2) | 80.5 | (3.0) |
|  | Thailand | 0.02 | (0.06) | 70.3 | (3.6) | 91.2 | (2.1) | 87.2 | (2.5) | 92.9 | (2.1) | 93.5 | (1.7) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.73 | (0.08) | 47.4 | (4.3) | 64.4 | (3.9) | 53.2 | (3.6) | 94.1 | (2.1) | 79.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.00 | (0.08) | 64.3 | (3.5) | 80.5 | (2.3) | 64.3 | (3.0) | 94.4 | (1.6) | 80.9 | (2.8) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of student-related factors affecting school climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 ) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink (aitाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in student-related factors affecting school climate

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of student-related factors affecting school climate |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following phenomena hindered learning "not at all" or "very little" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Students skippingclasses | Students lacking respect for teachers |  | Disruption of classes by students |  | Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs |  | Students intimidating or bullying other students |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia |  |  | 0.09 | (0.06) | -4.9 | (2.8) | -1.3 | (2.9) | 5.0 | (3.5) | 1.3 | (1.4) | 5.1 | (2.9) |
|  | Austria | -0.03 | (0.10) | 1.8 | (5.3) | -4.5 | (4.5) | 0.9 | (5.5) | 3.1 | (2.8) | -2.3 | (3.9) |
|  | Belgium | -0.22 | (0.09) | 1.1 | (3.3) | -0.4 | (3.4) | -4.2 | (3.4) | 1.6 | (2.4) | -0.7 | (3.1) |
|  | Canada | 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.8 | (3.5) | 13.9 | (2.8) | 15.3 | (3.4) | 11.5 | (2.8) | 3.1 | (2.8) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.27 | (0.08) | -15.6 | (4.7) | 0.2 | (3.6) | 2.6 | (4.5) | -0.3 | (1.4) | -2.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Denmark | 0.07 | (0.08) | -7.0 | (3.8) | -6.0 | (3.7) | 7.5 | (4.6) | -2.2 | (1.2) | 1.7 | (2.2) |
|  | Finland | -0.13 | (0.06) | -0.9 | (4.7) | -20.0 | (4.2) | -20.2 | (5.2) | 1.9 | (1.7) | -22.4 | (3.9) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 0.15 | (0.08) | 8.8 | (4.0) | 4.6 | (4.1) | 8.8 | (4.8) | 7.1 | (2.1) | 9.4 | (3.9) |
|  | Greece | 0.60 | (0.19) | 24.3 | (6.0) | 29.7 | (6.1) | 10.6 | (7.1) | 23.3 | (6.0) | 12.0 | (5.8) |
|  | Hungary | 0.04 | (0.10) | 4.5 | (4.7) | -3.3 | (4.0) | 13.6 | (4.7) | -0.9 | (2.8) | 2.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Iceland | 0.51 | (0.01) | 19.4 | (0.2) | 9.3 | (0.2) | 26.4 | (0.3) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 19.8 | (0.2) |
|  | Ireland | 0.46 | (0.11) | 6.8 | (4.8) | 3.4 | (5.2) | 23.8 | (5.2) | 13.0 | (4.8) | 6.6 | (4.7) |
|  | Italy | 0.26 | (0.07) | 26.7 | (3.8) | 1.3 | (3.2) | 6.7 | (3.9) | -2.3 | (0.8) | 2.1 | (2.1) |
|  | Japan | 0.08 | (0.10) | 12.5 | (3.6) | 13.9 | (4.2) | 7.4 | (3.1) | -0.8 | (1.1) | 3.0 | (2.7) |
|  | Korea | -0.69 | (0.16) | -1.8 | (4.1) | -14.9 | (5.2) | -12.8 | (4.7) | 6.2 | (3.7) | -6.9 | (4.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.13 | (0.00) | 13.4 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) | 4.8 | (0.1) | 7.7 | (0.0) | 4.5 | (0.1) |
|  | Mexico | 0.02 | (0.08) | -0.5 | (3.9) | 3.1 | (2.2) | 14.1 | (3.5) | -1.5 | (1.6) | 10.8 | (3.4) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.05 | (0.09) | 0.7 | (5.2) | 6.0 | (5.7) | 6.3 | (6.0) | -4.0 | (3.9) | -1.7 | (4.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.40 | (0.07) | 5.1 | (4.5) | 12.3 | (4.1) | 18.5 | (4.4) | 13.4 | (3.3) | 3.4 | (3.5) |
|  | Norway | 0.30 | (0.08) | -9.5 | (4.4) | 7.8 | (5.0) | 24.2 | (5.2) | 3.4 | c | 3.5 | (3.5) |
|  | Poland | 0.35 | (0.09) | 4.4 | (5.4) | 4.4 | (4.6) | 9.9 | (5.7) | 8.9 | (2.4) | 0.8 | (3.1) |
|  | Portugal | 0.24 | (0.12) | 8.6 | (5.6) | -14.7 | (5.2) | -19.3 | (5.9) | -4.8 | (2.5) | 0.1 | (3.7) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.21 | (0.08) | c | c | -19.5 | (4.0) | -6.5 | (5.4) | 2.5 | (2.0) | 2.8 | (1.6) |
|  | Spain | 0.45 | (0.08) | 13.0 | (4.0) | 10.3 | (4.0) | 21.5 | (3.9) | 0.9 | (1.9) | 9.2 | (2.6) |
|  | Sweden | 0.15 | (0.07) | -11.9 | (4.9) | 2.8 | (4.6) | 16.4 | (5.0) | -0.2 | (2.3) | 6.5 | (3.4) |
|  | Switzerland | 0.22 | (0.10) | -6.8 | (3.4) | 1.9 | (4.4) | 12.2 | (5.6) | 10.5 | (3.4) | 16.0 | (4.3) |
|  | Turkey | 0.26 | (0.16) | -9.5 | (5.7) | 16.5 | (6.1) | 17.8 | (6.3) | 16.8 | (4.3) | 22.7 | (5.3) |
|  | United States | 0.38 | (0.10) | 4.7 | (4.8) | 6.8 | (4.1) | 11.1 | (4.3) | 4.0 | (4.4) | 2.2 | (3.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.16 | (0.02) | 3.3 | (0.8) | 2.3 | (0.8) | 7.9 | (0.9) | 4.3 | (0.5) | 4.0 | (0.7) |
| ~ | Brazil | -0.09 | (0.12) | -2.8 | (4.7) | -11.9 | (4.4) | -15.7 | (4.3) | 3.0 | (3.7) | 3.4 | (4.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.19 | (0.15) | 15.0 | (3.9) | 13.3 | (4.5) | 17.8 | (4.6) | 16.6 | (3.4) | 18.7 | (3.8) |
|  | Indonesia | 2.68 | (0.14) | 69.2 | (3.9) | 65.5 | (3.7) | 73.2 | (4.0) | 66.2 | (4.1) | 63.0 | (3.9) |
|  | Latvia | 0.18 | (0.10) | 16.0 | (5.3) | -6.3 | (4.4) | -6.2 | (5.2) | 6.4 | (3.1) | 5.1 | (2.5) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.85 | (0.02) | 41.2 | (0.9) | 5.9 | (0.9) | 31.7 | (0.8) | -6.7 | c | 49.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 1.28 | (0.01) | 44.2 | (0.3) | 35.6 | (0.2) | 31.0 | (0.3) | 28.7 | (0.3) | 15.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 1.06 | (0.15) | 15.6 | (3.9) | 14.1 | (4.9) | 17.4 | (4.9) | 21.0 | (5.4) | 21.2 | (5.0) |
|  | Thailand | -0.04 | (0.09) | -10.9 | (4.9) | -0.7 | (3.0) | 5.9 | (3.5) | -5.3 | (2.3) | -2.5 | (2.3) |
|  | Tunisia | 0.67 | (0.13) | 14.3 | (5.8) | 22.5 | (5.7) | 31.3 | (4.9) | 39.2 | (4.4) | 22.5 | (5.2) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.29 | (0.11) | 6.3 | (5.4) | -2.7 | (3.4) | -23.6 | (3.9) | 1.8 | (2.6) | -7.6 | (3.4) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of student-related factors affecting school climate have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004 ) (see Annex A5 for more details).

[Part 1/2]
Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher morale
Table IV.5.21 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher morale |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Index of teacher morale |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The morale of teachers in this school is high | Teachers work with enthusiasm |  | Teachers take pride in this school |  | Teachers value academic achievement |  | The morale of teachers in this school is high |  | Teachers work with enthusiasm |  | Teachers take pride in this school |  | Teachers value academic achievement |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |  |  | Mean index S.E. |  | \% S.E. |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | 0.02 | (0.06) | 90.1 | (1.8) | 96.9 | (1.6) | 97.5 | (1.0) | 99.8 | (0.2) | 0.14 | (0.03) | 93.5 | (1.0) | 97.5 | (0.6) | 97.8 | (0.6) | 99.2 | (0.3) |
|  | Austria | 0.31 | (0.07) | 98.2 | (1.0) | 98.8 | (0.9) | 97.1 | (1.6) | 99.0 | (0.8) | 0.54 | (0.07) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c | 98.0 | (0.9) | 98.7 | (0.9) |
|  | Belgium | -0.54 | (0.05) | 87.4 | (2.1) | 93.4 | (1.4) | 95.0 | (1.1) | 90.5 | (1.6) | -0.27 | (0.06) | 88.7 | (2.0) | 95.3 | (1.4) | 94.5 | (1.5) | 94.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Canada | -0.04 | (0.05) | 87.7 | (1.7) | 95.3 | (1.1) | 97.5 | (0.7) | 99.0 | (0.4) | 0.18 | (0.04) | 90.2 | (1.3) | 96.2 | (1.0) | 98.9 | (0.4) | 99.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Czech Republic | -0.32 | (0.05) | 96.4 | (1.2) | 85.7 | (2.5) | 96.9 | (1.1) | 99.3 | (0.5) | -0.10 | (0.05) | 99.6 | (0.3) | 92.0 | (1.7) | 97.6 | (0.9) | 99.7 | (0.3) |
|  | Denmark | 0.14 | (0.06) | 98.8 | (0.9) | 100.0 | c | 99.2 | (0.5) | 97.6 | (0.7) | 0.40 | (0.06) | 98.7 | (0.7) | 99.4 | (0.5) | 96.4 | (1.4) | 99.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Finland | 0.14 | (0.05) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 96.2 | (1.2) | 95.9 | (1.3) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 0.33 | (0.06) | 99.2 | (0.6) | 97.0 | (1.2) | 93.8 | (2.1) | 99.6 | (0.4) |
|  | France | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | -0.39 | (0.07) | 79.8 | (3.1) | 86.5 | (2.5) | 94.3 | (1.7) | 91.8 | (1.9) |
|  | Germany | -0.12 | (0.06) | 96.6 | (1.4) | 96.1 | (1.2) | 89.6 | (2.0) | 97.4 | (1.2) | 0.01 | (0.06) | 96.7 | (1.4) | 99.1 | (0.6) | 93.0 | (1.9) | 95.8 | (1.5) |
|  | Greece | -0.08 | (0.12) | 87.1 | (3.3) | 83.7 | (3.6) | 87.3 | (3.0) | 99.3 | (0.7) | -0.41 | (0.09) | 83.5 | (2.8) | 84.0 | (2.7) | 85.5 | (3.5) | 91.8 | (2.6) |
|  | Hungary | -0.06 | (0.08) | 96.4 | (1.8) | 86.6 | (3.0) | 95.9 | (1.6) | 100.0 | (0.0) | -0.02 | (0.07) | 96.5 | (1.1) | 87.6 | (2.4) | 95.3 | (1.5) | 99.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Iceland | 0.45 | (0.00) | 98.7 | (0.0) | 98.8 | (0.0) | 98.4 | (0.0) | 99.0 | (0.0) | 0.53 | (0.00) | 97.5 | (0.1) | 95.3 | (0.1) | 97.9 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.09 | (0.09) | 87.6 | (2.6) | 96.8 | (1.6) | 95.0 | (1.8) | 98.8 | (0.9) | 0.49 | (0.08) | 93.6 | (2.0) | 96.5 | (1.5) | 98.7 | (0.9) | 100.0 | c |
|  | Italy | -0.76 | (0.05) | 75.4 | (2.4) | 81.2 | (2.8) | 87.4 | (2.0) | 94.0 | (1.4) | -0.60 | (0.03) | 73.1 | (1.7) | 79.8 | (1.7) | 91.7 | (1.1) | 96.6 | (0.6) |
|  | Japan | -0.52 | (0.08) | 90.1 | (2.5) | 93.6 | (1.9) | 79.7 | (3.0) | 75.4 | (3.2) | -0.49 | (0.07) | 96.6 | (1.5) | 97.7 | (1.3) | 89.8 | (2.3) | 75.6 | (2.6) |
|  | Korea | -0.56 | (0.08) | 80.2 | (3.4) | 93.4 | (2.0) | 85.2 | (3.1) | 86.8 | (2.7) | -0.32 | (0.09) | 79.3 | (3.0) | 96.5 | (1.6) | 90.8 | (2.2) | 93.4 | (1.8) |
|  | Luxembourg | -0.54 | (0.00) | 92.2 | (0.0) | 92.2 | (0.0) | 85.6 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.00 | (0.00) | 97.2 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 96.1 | (0.1) | 100.0 | c |
|  | Mexico | -0.17 | (0.07) | 91.1 | (1.9) | 89.9 | (1.9) | 87.2 | (2.7) | 92.4 | (1.9) | -0.05 | (0.04) | 95.0 | (0.9) | 93.5 | (0.9) | 94.2 | (0.9) | 95.3 | (0.9) |
|  | Netherlands | -0.35 | (0.06) | 98.2 | (1.0) | 100.0 | c | 96.7 | (1.6) | 96.9 | (1.5) | -0.19 | (0.07) | 97.5 | (1.1) | 100.0 | c | 96.0 | (1.5) | 94.9 | (1.6) |
|  | New Zealand | -0.01 | (0.07) | 91.2 | (2.0) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 97.8 | (1.1) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 0.36 | (0.06) | 94.3 | (1.3) | 99.5 | (0.5) | 98.7 | (0.4) | 100.0 | c |
|  | Norway | -0.11 | (0.07) | 98.2 | (1.1) | 94.8 | (1.7) | 91.1 | (2.3) | 100.0 | c | 0.26 | (0.06) | 98.9 | (0.8) | 97.7 | (1.1) | 96.1 | (1.5) | 99.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Poland | -0.08 | (0.07) | 81.4 | (3.1) | 96.9 | (1.1) | 94.9 | (1.8) | 99.4 | (0.6) | -0.14 | (0.08) | 86.1 | (2.8) | 96.5 | (1.4) | 99.2 | (0.7) | 98.5 | (1.0) |
|  | Portugal | -0.57 | (0.07) | 70.7 | (4.1) | 84.6 | (3.3) | 96.6 | (1.3) | 98.6 | (1.0) | -0.17 | (0.08) | 76.3 | (3.3) | 89.2 | (2.8) | 96.4 | (2.1) | 99.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Slovak Republic | -0.33 | (0.06) | 98.0 | (0.9) | 81.5 | (2.4) | 94.5 | (1.7) | 99.0 | (0.6) | -0.27 | (0.06) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 85.2 | (2.7) | 96.5 | (1.7) | 97.6 | (1.5) |
|  | Spain | -0.51 | (0.06) | 79.0 | (2.9) | 89.8 | (2.5) | 93.4 | (1.8) | 97.0 | (1.1) | -0.43 | (0.05) | 76.3 | (2.0) | 85.4 | (2.4) | 94.3 | (1.2) | 93.9 | (1.6) |
|  | Sweden | 0.32 | (0.06) | 99.5 | (0.5) | 99.5 | (0.5) | 95.9 | (1.5) | 99.0 | (0.7) | 0.39 | (0.07) | 96.9 | (1.3) | 96.9 | (1.3) | 93.9 | (1.9) | 100.0 | c |
|  | Switzerland | 0.04 | (0.07) | 94.2 | (1.5) | 99.3 | (0.1) | 93.9 | (1.7) | 98.2 | (0.5) | 0.31 | (0.06) | 96.2 | (1.3) | 98.4 | (0.9) | 98.6 | (0.8) | 97.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Turkey | -0.54 | (0.11) | 81.6 | (3.4) | 81.0 | (3.9) | 84.5 | (3.0) | 83.7 | (3.4) | -0.23 | (0.08) | 88.4 | (2.6) | 88.8 | (3.0) | 86.8 | (2.7) | 98.2 | (1.1) |
|  | United States | 0.07 | (0.07) | 88.5 | (2.4) | 95.3 | (1.3) | 96.5 | (1.1) | 99.4 | (0.5) | -0.03 | (0.08) | 81.4 | (3.2) | 95.2 | (1.8) | 97.9 | (0.9) | 99.5 | (0.5) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | -0.17 | (0.01) | 90.4 | (0.4) | 92.8 | (0.4) | 93.1 | (0.3) | 96.3 | (0.3) | 0.01 | (0.01) | 91.7 | (0.3) | 94.3 | (0.3) | 95.2 | (0.3) | 97.0 | (0.3) |


| ก | Brazil | -0.26 | (0.08) | 89.9 | (2.7) | 83.2 | (3.2) | 93.7 | (2.4) | 94.1 | (2.3) | -0.50 | (0.05) | 75.6 | (2.5) | 77.7 | (2.3) | 92.8 | (1.2) | 94.5 | (1.1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hong Kong-China | -0.51 | (0.07) | 85.9 | (2.8) | 94.8 | (1.8) | 87.1 | (2.4) | 94.9 | (1.5) | -0.42 | (0.07) | 78.2 | (3.5) | 98.0 | (1.1) | 88.8 | (2.4) | 100.0 | C |
|  | Indonesia | 0.41 | (0.07) | 97.6 | (1.1) | 93.9 | (1.6) | 96.1 | (1.5) | 99.1 | (0.6) | 0.59 | (0.07) | 100.0 | c | 97.9 | (0.9) | 98.5 | (1.0) | 100.0 | c |
|  | Latvia | -0.02 | (0.07) | 98.9 | (0.8) | 97.9 | (1.1) | 98.2 | (1.0) | 95.8 | (1.7) | 0.09 | (0.06) | 100.0 | c | 98.2 | (1.1) | 99.6 | (0.4) | 98.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Liechtenstein | -0.35 | (0.01) | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 0.08 | (0.01) | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c | 100.0 | c |
|  | Macao-China | -0.77 | (0.00) | 82.4 | (0.2) | 96.7 | (0.1) | 83.4 | (0.1) | 91.7 | (0.1) | -0.50 | (0.00) | 92.7 | (0.0) | 92.7 | (0.0) | 88.8 | (0.0) | 91.4 | (0.0) |
|  | Russian Federation | -0.37 | (0.06) | 93.4 | (1.8) | 86.8 | (2.0) | 97.4 | (1.5) | 98.1 | (0.8) | -0.04 | (0.05) | 97.8 | (0.9) | 91.6 | (1.7) | 96.8 | (1.1) | 98.1 | (1.0) |
|  | Thailand | -0.33 | (0.09) | 88.8 | (2.7) | 86.8 | (3.1) | 92.4 | (2.3) | 91.0 | (2.6) | 0.06 | (0.08) | 90.1 | (2.5) | 93.9 | (1.9) | 96.8 | (1.4) | 95.9 | (1.5) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.10 | (0.08) | 93.2 | (2.1) | 90.3 | (2.2) | 95.2 | (1.5) | 91.7 | (2.4) | -0.66 | (0.09) | 74.3 | (3.5) | 67.7 | (3.4) | 82.2 | (3.3) | 92.0 | (2.4) |
|  | Uruguay | -0.28 | (0.06) | 98.0 | (0.7) | 91.3 | (2.1) | 95.0 | (1.4) | 98.0 | (1.1) | -0.28 | (0.07) | 91.3 | (2.1) | 88.0 | (2.3) | 91.6 | (2.1) | 93.2 | (1.9) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher morale have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table
may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details).
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher morale
Table IV.5.21 Results based on school principals' reports

|  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Index of teacher morale |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals agree or strongly agree with the following statements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The morale of teachers in this school is high | Teachers work with enthusiasm |  | Teachers take pride in this school |  | Teachers value academic achievement |  |
|  |  | Dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. | \% dif. | S.E. |
|  | Australia |  |  | 0.13 | (0.07) | 3.4 | (2.1) | 0.6 | (1.7) | 0.3 | (1.1) | -0.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Austria | 0.23 | (0.10) | 1.7 | (1.0) | 1.2 | c | 0.9 | (1.8) | -0.3 | (1.2) |
|  | Belgium | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.3 | (2.9) | 1.8 | (2.0) | -0.4 | (1.9) | 4.1 | (2.2) |
|  | Canada | 0.22 | (0.06) | 2.5 | (2.1) | 1.0 | (1.4) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Czech Republic | 0.22 | (0.07) | 3.1 | (1.2) | 6.3 | (3.0) | 0.8 | (1.4) | 0.4 | (0.5) |
|  | Denmark | 0.26 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (1.1) | -0.6 | c | -2.8 | (1.5) | 1.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Finland | 0.19 | (0.08) | 1.3 | (1.2) | 0.8 | (1.7) | -2.1 | (2.4) | 0.2 | (0.7) |
|  | France | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
|  | Germany | 0.13 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (2.0) | 3.0 | (1.4) | 3.4 | (2.8) | -1.5 | (1.9) |
|  | Greece | -0.33 | (0.15) | -3.6 | (4.3) | 0.3 | (4.5) | -1.9 | (4.6) | -7.5 | (2.7) |
|  | Hungary | 0.04 | (0.10) | 0.2 | (2.1) | 0.9 | (3.8) | -0.6 | (2.2) | -1.0 | (0.8) |
|  | Iceland | 0.08 | (0.01) | -1.2 | (0.1) | -3.5 | (0.1) | -0.6 | (0.1) | -0.1 | (0.1) |
|  | Ireland | 0.41 | (0.12) | 5.9 | (3.3) | -0.3 | (2.1) | 3.7 | (2.1) | 1.2 | c |
|  | Italy | 0.16 | (0.06) | -2.3 | (3.0) | -1.4 | (3.2) | 4.3 | (2.3) | 2.6 | (1.6) |
|  | Japan | 0.04 | (0.11) | 6.4 | (2.9) | 4.1 | (2.3) | 10.1 | (3.8) | 0.2 | (4.1) |
|  | Korea | 0.24 | (0.12) | -0.9 | (4.5) | 3.1 | (2.6) | 5.5 | (3.8) | 6.6 | (3.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.55 | (0.00) | 5.0 | (0.0) | 7.8 | c | 10.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c |
|  | Mexico | 0.12 | (0.08) | 3.9 | (2.1) | 3.6 | (2.1) | 7.0 | (2.8) | 2.9 | (2.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 0.16 | (0.09) | -0.8 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | -0.8 | (2.2) | -2.1 | (2.2) |
|  | New Zealand | 0.36 | (0.09) | 3.1 | (2.4) | 1.7 | (1.2) | 0.9 | (1.2) | 2.7 | c |
|  | Norway | 0.37 | (0.09) | 0.7 | (1.4) | 2.9 | (2.1) | 5.1 | (2.7) | -0.4 | c |
|  | Poland | -0.06 | (0.10) | 4.7 | (4.2) | -0.3 | (1.8) | 4.3 | (1.9) | -0.8 | (1.2) |
|  | Portugal | 0.40 | (0.11) | 5.6 | (5.3) | 4.6 | (4.4) | -0.2 | (2.4) | 1.0 | (1.0) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 0.07 | (0.09) | 0.0 | (1.4) | 3.7 | (3.6) | 2.0 | (2.4) | -1.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Spain | 0.08 | (0.08) | -2.6 | (3.5) | -4.4 | (3.4) | 0.9 | (2.1) | -3.1 | (2.0) |
|  | Sweden | 0.07 | (0.09) | -2.6 | (1.4) | -2.6 | (1.4) | -2.0 | (2.4) | 1.0 | c |
|  | Switzerland | 0.27 | (0.09) | 2.0 | (2.0) | -0.9 | (0.9) | 4.7 | (1.9) | -0.9 | (1.4) |
|  | Turkey | 0.31 | (0.14) | 6.8 | (4.3) | 7.8 | (4.9) | 2.2 | (4.0) | 14.4 | (3.6) |
|  | United States | -0.10 | (0.10) | -7.0 | (4.1) | -0.1 | (2.2) | 1.4 | (1.4) | 0.1 | (0.7) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 0.18 | (0.02) | 1.3 | (0.5) | 1.5 | (0.5) | 2.1 | (0.5) | 0.7 | (0.4) |
|  | Brazil | -0.24 | (0.10) | -14.2 | (3.7) | -5.5 | (3.9) | -0.9 | (2.7) | 0.4 | (2.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.09 | (0.10) | -7.7 | (4.4) | 3.2 | (2.2) | 1.7 | (3.4) | 5.1 |  |
|  | Indonesia | 0.18 | (0.10) | 2.4 | c | 4.0 | (1.9) | 2.4 | (1.8) | 0.9 | c |
|  | Latvia | 0.11 | (0.09) | 1.1 | c | 0.3 | (1.6) | 1.3 | (1.1) | 3.0 | (1.8) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.42 | (0.01) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
|  | Macao-China | 0.26 | (0.00) | 10.3 | (0.2) | -4.0 | (0.1) | 5.4 | (0.2) | -0.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Russian Federation | 0.33 | (0.08) | 4.4 | (2.0) | 4.9 | (2.7) | -0.6 | (1.9) | 0.0 | (1.2) |
|  | Thailand | 0.40 | (0.12) | 1.3 | (3.7) | 7.0 | (3.6) | 4.4 | (2.7) | 4.9 | (3.0) |
|  | Tunisia | -0.55 | (0.12) | -19.0 | (4.1) | -22.6 | (4.0) | -13.0 | (3.7) | 0.3 | (3.4) |
|  | Uruguay | 0.01 | (0.09) | -6.7 | (2.2) | -3.3 | (3.2) | -3.4 | (2.5) | -4.8 | (2.1) |

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
For comparability over time, PISA 2003 values on the index of teacher morale have been rescaled to the PISA 2012 scale of the index. PISA 2003 results reported in this table may thus differ from those presented in Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003 (OECD, 2004) (see Annex A5 for more details). StatLink 州页http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517
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Change between 2003 and 2012 in arriving late for school
Table IV.5.22 Results based on students' self-reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 (PISA 2012 - PISA 2003) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students who reported having arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students who reported having arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students who reported having arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Not at all |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { One or } \\ \text { two times } \end{gathered}$ |  | Three or four times |  | Five or <br> more times |  | Not at all |  | One or two times |  | Three orfour times |  | Five or more times |  | Not at all |  | One or two times |  | Three or four times |  | Five or more times |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Australia | 63.5 | (0.7) | 25.5 | (0.5) | 6.5 | (0.3) | 4.5 | (0.2) | 64.5 | (0.6) | 25.4 | (0.5) | 6.6 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.9) | -0.1 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.4) | -0.9 | (0.3) |
|  | Austria | 76.9 | (1.1) | 16.5 | (0.8) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 2.9 | (0.3) | 79.1 | (0.9) | 15.6 | (0.7) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 2.2 | (1.4) | -0.9 | (1.1) | -0.4 | (0.4) | -0.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Belgium | 71.9 | (0.8) | 20.1 | (0.6) | 4.3 | (0.3) | 3.8 | (0.3) | 72.7 | (0.7) | 20.8 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 2.8 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.8) | -0.6 | (0.5) | -0.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Canada | 56.2 | (0.6) | 27.8 | (0.5) | 9.3 | (0.3) | 6.8 | (0.3) | 56.9 | (0.7) | 28.6 | (0.5) | 9.2 | (0.4) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.9) | 0.8 | (0.7) | -0.1 | (0.5) | -1.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Czech Republic | 76.9 | (0.7) | 17.6 | (0.6) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.2) | 73.0 | (0.8) | 20.7 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.3) | 3.0 | (0.3) | -3.9 | (1.1) | 3.2 | (0.9) | 0.3 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Denmark | 56.9 | (1.3) | 26.8 | (0.8) | 9.6 | (0.6) | 6.7 | (0.6) | 61.5 | (1.1) | 26.3 | (0.7) | 7.5 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (1.7) | -0.5 | (1.1) | -2.0 | (0.8) | -2.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Finland | 55.5 | (1.1) | 29.7 | (0.7) | 8.9 | (0.5) | 5.9 | (0.4) | 57.0 | (0.9) | 30.8 | (0.7) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 4.0 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (1.5) | 1.1 | (1.0) | -0.7 | (0.7) | -1.9 | (0.5) |
|  | France | 67.6 | (1.2) | 24.1 | (0.9) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 3.5 | (0.3) | 67.7 | (0.9) | 24.4 | (0.7) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (1.5) | 0.3 | (1.2) | 0.2 | (0.5) | -0.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Germany | 78.6 | (1.0) | 15.5 | (0.7) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 2.4 | (0.3) | 77.3 | (0.8) | 17.8 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.2) | -1.3 | (1.2) | 2.3 | (0.9) | -0.5 | (0.5) | -0.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Greece | 51.8 | (1.1) | 30.4 | (0.8) | 9.4 | (0.4) | 8.3 | (0.5) | 50.7 | (1.0) | 29.3 | (0.7) | 10.5 | (0.5) | 9.4 | (0.4) | -1.1 | (1.4) | -1.1 | (1.1) | 1.1 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.6) |
|  | Hungary | 72.4 | (1.0) | 20.7 | (0.8) | 3.8 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.4) | 75.9 | (1.2) | 18.6 | (1.0) | 2.9 | (0.4) | 2.6 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (1.6) | -2.1 | (1.3) | -0.8 | (0.5) | -0.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Iceland | 54.4 | (0.9) | 29.3 | (0.8) | 9.9 | (0.5) | 6.4 | (0.4) | 65.0 | (0.8) | 26.8 | (0.8) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.2) | 10.6 | (1.2) | -2.5 | (1.1) | -4.2 | (0.6) | -4.0 | (0.5) |
|  | Ireland | 71.3 | (1.0) | 21.0 | (0.8) | 4.3 | (0.4) | 3.4 | (0.4) | 72.6 | (1.0) | 20.1 | (0.7) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 2.5 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (1.5) | -0.9 | (1.1) | 0.4 | (0.6) | -0.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Italy | 55.4 | (1.0) | 29.6 | (0.8) | 7.9 | (0.4) | 7.1 | (0.4) | 64.8 | (0.6) | 26.3 | (0.5) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (0.2) | 9.4 | (1.2) | -3.3 | (0.9) | -2.5 | (0.5) | -3.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Japan | 83.7 | (1.0) | 11.7 | (0.6) | 2.6 | (0.4) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 91.1 | (0.6) | 7.5 | (0.5) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.1) | 7.4 | (1.1) | -4.1 | (0.8) | -1.7 | (0.4) | -1.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Korea | 73.0 | (1.0) | 17.8 | (0.7) | 5.3 | (0.4) | 3.8 | (0.3) | 74.9 | (1.0) | 17.3 | (0.7) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (1.5) | -0.5 | (1.0) | -0.7 | (0.5) | -0.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Luxembourg | 64.3 | (0.6) | 24.5 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.4) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 70.9 | (0.5) | 21.4 | (0.5) | 4.6 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.2) | 6.6 | (0.8) | -3.1 | (0.8) | -0.9 | (0.5) | -2.6 | (0.4) |
|  | Mexico | 54.5 | (1.0) | 33.5 | (0.9) | 7.4 | (0.3) | 4.5 | (0.3) | 60.1 | (0.6) | 31.9 | (0.5) | 5.9 | (0.2) | 2.1 | (0.1) | 5.6 | (1.2) | -1.6 | (1.0) | -1.6 | (0.4) | -2.4 | (0.3) |
|  | Netherlands | 55.5 | (1.1) | 31.5 | (0.8) | 7.3 | (0.5) | 5.7 | (0.6) | 69.7 | (1.0) | 23.4 | (0.8) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.3) | 14.2 | (1.5) | -8.1 | (1.1) | -3.6 | (0.6) | -2.4 | (0.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 54.3 | (1.1) | 28.1 | (0.8) | 9.3 | (0.4) | 8.3 | (0.6) | 57.9 | (1.3) | 28.0 | (0.8) | 8.9 | (0.6) | 5.2 | (0.3) | 3.7 | (1.7) | -0.1 | (1.2) | -0.4 | (0.7) | -3.2 | (0.6) |
|  | Norway | 64.4 | (0.9) | 24.3 | (0.7) | 6.0 | (0.4) | 5.3 | (0.4) | 70.8 | (1.0) | 21.2 | (0.7) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 6.4 | (1.3) | -3.1 | (1.0) | -1.1 | (0.5) | -2.2 | (0.5) |
|  | Poland | 63.5 | (0.9) | 23.2 | (0.7) | 7.3 | (0.5) | 6.0 | (0.4) | 57.6 | (1.2) | 28.2 | (0.7) | 8.0 | (0.5) | 6.2 | (0.5) | -5.9 | (1.5) | 5.0 | (1.0) | 0.6 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Portugal | 46.0 | (1.1) | 39.4 | (0.8) | 9.0 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.4) | 44.8 | (1.0) | 39.0 | (0.7) | 10.2 | (0.5) | 6.0 | (0.4) | -1.3 | (1.5) | -0.4 | (1.1) | 1.2 | (0.8) | 0.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Slovak Republic | 77.1 | (1.0) | 17.9 | (0.7) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.2) | 73.8 | (0.9) | 20.1 | (0.8) | 3.7 | (0.3) | 2.5 | (0.3) | -3.4 | (1.3) | 2.2 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.4 | (0.4) |
|  | Spain | 58.8 | (0.9) | 26.3 | (0.6) | 7.2 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (0.5) | 64.7 | (0.8) | 24.3 | (0.6) | 6.5 | (0.2) | 4.4 | (0.2) | 5.9 | (1.2) | -1.9 | (0.9) | -0.7 | (0.4) | -3.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Sweden | 49.2 | (1.2) | 29.0 | (0.9) | 11.8 | (0.6) | 10.1 | (0.5) | 44.4 | (1.0) | 34.3 | (0.7) | 12.9 | (0.5) | 8.4 | (0.5) | -4.8 | (1.6) | 5.4 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.8) | -1.6 | (0.7) |
|  | Switzerland | 73.4 | (0.8) | 20.4 | (0.7) | 3.5 | (0.2) | 2.6 | (0.2) | 75.7 | (0.8) | 19.4 | (0.6) | 3.4 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 2.2 | (1.2) | -1.0 | (0.9) | -0.1 | (0.4) | -1.1 | (0.3) |
|  | Turkey | 73.3 | (1.1) | 20.1 | (0.7) | 4.0 | (0.4) | 2.6 | (0.4) | 56.2 | (1.0) | 30.1 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.5) | 5.3 | (0.4) | -17.1 | (1.5) | 10.0 | (1.0) | 4.4 | (0.6) | 2.8 | (0.6) |
|  | United States | 65.4 | (1.0) | 23.3 | (0.8) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 5.0 | (0.4) | 69.9 | (1.2) | 21.8 | (0.8) | 5.1 | (0.4) | 3.2 | (0.4) | 4.5 | (1.5) | -1.5 | (1.1) | -1.1 | (0.6) | -1.9 | (0.6) |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 64.3 | (0.2) | 24.3 | (0.1) | 6.4 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (0.1) | 66.2 | (0.2) | 24.1 | (0.1) | 5.9 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.1) | 1.9 | (0.2) | -0.2 | (0.2) | -0.5 | (0.1) | -1.2 | (0.1) |
|  | Brazil | 63.0 | (1.2) | 25.8 | (0.8) | 7.0 | (0.5) | 4.2 | (0.4) | 66.3 | (0.8) | 24.8 | (0.6) | 5.5 | (0.3) | 3.4 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (1.5) | -0.9 | (1.0) | -1.6 | (0.6) | -0.8 | (0.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 83.0 | (0.8) | 13.4 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.2) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 85.4 | (0.6) | 12.5 | (0.5) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (1.0) | -0.9 | (0.8) | -0.8 | (0.3) | -0.6 | (0.3) |
|  | Indonesia | 64.0 | (1.1) | 28.4 | (0.8) | 4.9 | (0.4) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 73.0 | (1.0) | 22.2 | (0.8) | 3.0 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.3) | 9.0 | (1.5) | -6.2 | (1.1) | -1.9 | (0.5) | -0.9 | (0.4) |
|  | Latvia | 51.8 | (1.5) | 30.0 | (1.0) | 9.9 | (0.5) | 8.3 | (0.7) | 43.7 | (1.2) | 35.0 | (0.9) | 12.7 | (0.6) | 8.6 | (0.7) | -8.0 | (1.9) | 5.0 | (1.4) | 2.8 | (0.8) | 0.3 | (1.0) |
|  | Liechtenstein | 79.3 | (2.4) | 14.0 | (2.1) | 4.9 | (1.1) | 1.8 | (0.8) | 81.3 | (2.3) | 16.5 | (2.1) | 1.0 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (3.3) | 2.5 | (2.9) | -3.9 | (1.2) | -0.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Macao-China | 81.4 | (1.1) | 14.4 | (1.1) | 3.2 | (0.5) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 74.9 | (0.5) | 20.9 | (0.5) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 1.5 | (0.2) | -6.5 | (1.2) | 6.5 | (1.2) | -0.5 | (0.6) | 0.5 | (0.3) |
|  | Russian Federation | 59.4 | (1.2) | 27.2 | (1.1) | 7.1 | (0.5) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 53.3 | (1.3) | 30.9 | (0.8) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 7.6 | (0.5) | -6.1 | (1.8) | 3.7 | (1.4) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 1.3 | (0.6) |
|  | Thailand | 66.0 | (1.2) | 23.7 | (0.8) | 5.7 | (0.5) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 65.9 | (1.2) | 24.0 | (0.8) | 6.3 | (0.5) | 3.8 | (0.3) | -0.1 | (1.7) | 0.2 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (0.7) | -0.7 | (0.5) |
|  | Tunisia | 62.1 | (1.1) | 27.5 | (0.9) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 4.6 | (0.4) | 48.2 | (0.9) | 38.4 | (0.8) | 7.6 | (0.4) | 5.8 | (0.5) | -13.9 | (1.4) | 10.9 | (1.2) | 1.9 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Uruguay | 43.5 | (1.1) | 36.2 | (0.8) | 11.7 | (0.6) | 8.6 | (0.4) | 40.7 | (0.9) | 38.1 | (0.7) | 12.6 | (0.5) | 8.6 | (0.5) | -2.8 | (1.4) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 0.9 | (0.8) | 0.0 | (0.7) |

[^47]
［Part 1／1］
Change between 2003 and 2012 in the concentration of students arriving late for school
Table IV．5．23 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | PISA 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PISA 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2003 and 2012 （PISA 2012 －PISA 2003） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percentage of students who are in schools where，in the two weeks prior to the PISA test．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students who are in schools where，in the two weeks prior to the PISA test．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students who are in schools where，in the two weeks prior to the PISA test．．． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { dif. } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| S | Australia | 13.3 | （1．9） | 71.2 | （2．8） | 15.5 | （2．3） | 0.0 |  | 17.1 | （1．4） | 57.1 | （1．9） | 25.8 | （1．7） | 0.0 | （0．0） | 3.8 | （2．4） | －14．1 | （3．4） | 10.3 | （2．8） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Austria | 6.2 | （1．7） | 33.0 | （3．3） | 57.4 | （3．6） | 3.4 | （1．0） | 6.1 | （1．9） | 28.5 | （3．2） | 59.6 | （3．7） | 5.8 | （1．7） | －0．1 | （2．6） | －4．5 | （4．6） | 2.2 | （5．2） | 2.5 | （1．9） |
|  | Belgium | 10.2 | （1．7） | 41.4 | （3．2） | 48.0 | （3．1） | 0.4 | （0．4） | 6.7 | （1．3） | 46.1 | （3．0） | 46.9 | （2．8） | 0.3 | （0．2） | －3．5 | （2．2） | 4.7 | （4．4） | －1．1 | （4．2） | －0．1 | （0．4） |
|  | Canada | 32.1 | （2．2） | 55.4 | （2．3） | 11.8 | （1．3） | 0.7 | （0．4） | 31.5 | （2．3） | 53.7 | （2．7） | 14.5 | （1．4） | 0.2 | （0．1） | －0．6 | （3．2） | －1．7 | （3．5） | 2.7 | （1．9） | －0．5 | （0．5） |
|  | Czech Republic | 1.2 | （0．6） | 38.9 | （3．4） | 57.7 | （3．5） | 2.2 | （0．9） | 8.6 | （1．7） | 39.3 | （2．8） | 47.2 | （2．8） | 4.9 | （1．3） | 7.4 | （1．8） | 0.5 | （4．4） | －10．6 | （4．5） | 2.7 | （1．6） |
|  | Denmark | 32.7 | （3．0） | 51.7 | （3．0） | 15.5 | （2．6） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 23.0 | （2．8） | 52.0 | （3．3） | 23.9 | （2．9） | 1.1 | （0．8） | －9．7 | （4．1） | 0.3 | （4．5） | 8.4 | （3．9） | 1.0 | （0．8） |
|  | Finland | 38.7 | （3．9） | 50.9 | （4．1） | 10.4 | （1．9） | 0.0 | （0．0） | 33.3 | （3．3） | 52.6 | （3．7） | 13.5 | （2．4） | 0.5 | （0．4） | －5．3 | （5．1） | 1.7 | （5．5） | 3.1 | （3．1） | 0.5 | （0．4） |
|  | France | 9.8 | （2．4） | 56.2 | （4．0） | 33.4 | （3．9） | 0.6 | （0．5） | 13.9 | （2．3） | 47.5 | （3．3） | 37.3 | （3．0） | 1.2 | （0．7） | 4.1 | （3．3） | －8．7 | （5．2） | 3.9 | （4．9） | 0.6 | （0．8） |
|  | Germany | 3.4 | （1．3） | 28.7 | （3．1） | 64.8 | （3．3） | 3.1 | （1．1） | 4.2 | （1．3） | 35.2 | （3．4） | 57.2 | （3．3） | 3.4 | （1．2） | 0.8 | （1．8） | 6.5 | （4．6） | －7．6 | （4．7） | 0.3 | （1．7） |
|  | Greece | 44.1 | （4．7） | 51.3 | （4．6） | 4.4 | （1．2） | 0.2 | （0．1） | 51.1 | （4．0） | 44.9 | （4．1） | 3.6 | （1．4） | 0.4 | （0．2） | 7.1 | （6．1） | －6．4 | （6．2） | －0．8 | （1．8） | 0.1 | （0．3） |
|  | Hungary | 9.0 | （1．9） | 43.2 | （3．2） | 43.3 | （3．4） | 4.4 | （1．5） | 10.2 | （1．9） | 28.9 | （3．5） | 55.5 | （3．6） | 5.4 | （1．1） | 1.2 | （2．7） | －14．4 | （4．8） | 12.2 | （5．0） | 1.0 | （1．9） |
|  | Iceland | 45.3 | （0．2） | 44.6 | （0．2） | 8.1 | （0．1） | 1.9 | （0．1） | 12.2 | （0．1） | 65.9 | （0．2） | 19.6 | （0．2） | 2.3 | （0．1） | －33．1 | （0．2） | 21.3 | （0．3） | 11.4 | （0．2） | 0.4 | （0．1） |
|  | Ireland | 8.9 | （2．3） | 41.2 | （4．5） | 49.8 | （4．4） | 0.0 | c | 5.6 | （1．7） | 43.3 | （3．5） | 51.1 | （3．6） | 0.0 | c | －3．3 | （2．9） | 2.0 | （5．6） | 1.3 | （5．7） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Italy | 34.2 | （3．4） | 55.7 | （3．2） | 9.9 | （1．9） | 0.2 | （0．2） | 17.7 | （1．6） | 56.8 | （2．0） | 24.8 | （1．7） | 0.7 | （0．3） | －16．5 | （3．7） | 1.1 | （3．7） | 14.9 | （2．6） | 0.5 | （0．3） |
|  | Japan | 2.3 | （1．2） | 20.2 | （3．3） | 71.4 | （3．5） | 6.1 | （1．9） | 0.2 | （0．2） | 6.2 | （1．7） | 80.8 | （2．9） | 12.7 | （2．4） | －2．1 | （1．2） | －14．0 | （3．7） | 9.5 | （4．6） | 6.6 | （3．1） |
|  | Korea | 5.0 | （1．9） | 48.1 | （4．5） | 46.8 | （4．2） | 0.2 | （0．1） | 5.1 | （1．5） | 45.5 | （3．6） | 47.4 | （3．5） | 2.0 | （1．2） | 0.1 | （2．4） | －2．5 | （5．8） | 0.5 | （5．5） | 1.9 | （1．2） |
|  | Luxembourg | 10.2 | （0．0） | 77.6 | （0．1） | 12.1 | （0．1） | 0.0 | c | 3.5 | （0．1） | 51.9 | （0．1） | 44.6 | （0．1） | 0.0 | c | －6．8 | （0．1） | －25．7 | （0．1） | 32.5 | （0．1） | 0.0 |  |
|  | Mexico | 36.8 | （3．1） | 53.5 | （3．3） | 7.8 | （1．6） | 1.9 | （0．8） | 27.1 | （1．7） | 54.3 | （1．8） | 17.8 | （1．4） | 0.8 | （0．1） | －9．7 | （3．5） | 0.8 | （3．8） | 10.0 | （2．2） | －1．1 | （0．8） |
|  | Netherlands | 40.9 | （3．7） | 45.2 | （4．1） | 13.9 | （2．8） | 0.0 |  | 11.9 | （2．3） | 44.4 | （3．8） | 43.7 | （3．7） | 0.0 |  | －29．1 | （4．4） | －0．8 | （5．5） | 29.8 | （4．6） | 0.0 | c |
|  | New Zealand | 34.5 | （3．0） | 56.7 | （2．9） | 8.8 | （1．9） | 0.0 | （0．0） | 30.1 | （3．5） | 57.2 | （4．1） | 12.7 | （2．8） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －4．4 | （4．6） | 0.4 | （5．0） | 3.9 | （3．4） | 0.1 | （0．1） |
|  | Norway | 12.6 | （2．6） | 67.3 | （3．5） | 18.2 | （2．9） | 2.0 | （0．7） | 7.6 | （2．0） | 55.0 | （3．6） | 35.5 | （3．6） | 1.8 | （0．7） | －4．9 | （3．2） | －12．3 | （5．0） | 17.4 | （4．6） | －0．1 | （1．0） |
|  | Poland | 17.6 | （3．0） | 58.3 | （3．6） | 23.9 | （2．8） | 0.2 | （0．1） | 33.3 | （3．5） | 45.0 | （4．0） | 21.1 | （2．9） | 0.5 | （0．3） | 15.7 | （4．6） | －13．3 | （5．3） | －2．7 | （4．0） | 0.3 | （0．3） |
|  | Portugal | 65.2 | （3．5） | 31.2 | （3．2） | 3.6 | （1．6） | 0.0 |  | 64.7 | （4．0） | 34.2 | （4．0） | 1.0 | （0．8） | 0.1 | （0．1） | －0．5 | （5．3） | 3.0 | （5．1） | －2．6 | （1．8） | 0.1 | c |
|  | Slovak Republic | 2.2 | （0．9） | 38.4 | （3．2） | 55.3 | （3．4） | 4.0 | （1．2） | 6.0 | （1．2） | 43.1 | （3．7） | 46.5 | （4．0） | 4.5 | （1．1） | 3.8 | （1．5） | 4.6 | （4．9） | －8．8 | （5．2） | 0.5 | （1．6） |
|  | Spain | 33.9 | （2．9） | 51.3 | （3．2） | 14.8 | （2．2） | 0.0 | （0．0） | 17.5 | （2．0） | 55.2 | （3．2） | 27.2 | （2．9） | 0.1 | （0．0） | －16．4 | （3．5） | 3.9 | （4．6） | 12.4 | （3．6） | 0.0 | （0．0） |
|  | Sweden | 48.2 | （3．7） | 45.7 | （3．7） | 5.9 | （1．6） | 0.2 | （0．2） | 65.5 | （3．4） | 32.1 | （3．2） | 2.1 | （1．1） | 0.3 | （0．2） | 17.2 | （5．0） | －13．6 | （4．9） | －3．8 | （1．9） | 0.1 | （0．2） |
|  | Switzerland | 8.0 | （1．3） | 38.0 | （4．0） | 51.0 | （4．0） | 3.0 | （0．5） | 5.1 | （1．3） | 36.1 | （2．8） | 55.7 | （3．0） | 3.1 | （0．9） | －2．9 | （1．8） | －1．9 | （4．9 | 4.7 | （5．0） | 0.1 | （1．1） |
|  | Turkey | 5.6 | （1．9） | 44.7 | （4．6） | 49.6 | （4．4） | 0.1 | （0．1） | 24.9 | （3．8） | 68.5 | （3．9） | 6.6 | （1．8） | 0.1 | （0．0） | 19.3 | （4．3） | 23.7 | （6．1） | －42．9 | （4．8） | －0．1 | （0．1） |
|  | United States | 19.4 | （2．2） | 47.8 | （3．4） | 31.5 | （2．7） | 1.3 | （0．6） | 9.5 | （2．2） | 49.2 | （4．3） | 40.8 | （4．2） | 0.5 | （0．2） | －9．9 | （3．1） | 1.3 | （5．5 | 9.4 | （5．0） | －0．7 | （0．6） |
|  | OECD average 2003 | 21.8 | （0．5） | 47.8 | （0．6） | 29.1 | （0．5） | 1.2 | （0．1） | 19.1 | （0．4） | 45.9 | （0．6） | 33.2 | （0．5） | 1.8 | （0．2） | －2．7 | （0．6） | －2．0 | （0．9） | 4.1 | （0．7） | 0.6 | （0．2） |
|  | Brazil | 19.8 | （3．1） | 55.1 | （3．9） | 24.3 | （3．3） | 0.8 | （0．4） | 14.8 | （1．8） | 50.9 | （2．7） | 34.0 | （2．4） | 0.3 | （0．1） | －5．0 | （3．5） | －4．2 | （4．7） | 9.7 | （4．1） | －0．5 | （0．4） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 0.6 | （0．6） | 24.8 | （3．1） | 72.0 | （3．2） | 2.6 | （1．3） | 0.2 | （0．0） | 11.3 | （2．4） | 84.6 | （2．5） | 3.8 | （1．3） | －0．4 | （0．6） | －13．5 | （3．9） | 12.6 | （4．0） | 1.3 | （1．8） |
|  | Indonesia | 14.8 | （2．4） | 65.3 | （3．5） | 19.2 | （2．9） | 0.6 | （0．6） | 9.0 | （1．9） | 39.2 | （3．5） | 50.0 | （3．2） | 1.7 | （1．0） | －5．8 | （3．0） | －26．1 | （4．9） | 30.9 | （4．4） | 1.1 | （1．2） |
|  | Latvia | 44.3 | （4．2） | 45.6 | （4．5） | 8.9 | （2．5） | 1.2 | （0．7） | 65.9 | （3．4） | 29.7 | （3．2） | 4.0 | （1．4） | 0.4 | （0．2） | 21.6 | （5．4） | －15．9 | （5．6） | －4．9 | （2．9） | －0．8 | （0．8） |
|  | Liechtenstein | 0.0 |  | 15.1 | （0．5） | 84.9 | （0．5） | 0.0 | c | 1.0 | （0．6） | 18.8 | （0．9） | 80.2 | （1．1） | 0.0 | c | 1.0 | c | 3.8 | （1．0） | －4．7 | （1．2） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Macao－China | 5.1 | （0．1） | 14.0 | （0．2） | 80.9 | （0．3） | 0.0 | c | 8.2 | （0．1） | 34.0 | （0．0） | 57.8 | （0．1） | 0.0 | c | 3.1 | （0．2） | 20.0 | （0．2 | －23．1 | （0．3） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Russian Federation | 27.3 | （3．6） | 60.4 | （4．0） | 10.9 | （2．8） | 1.4 | （0．5） | 39.7 | （4．0） | 48.6 | （4．5） | 9.9 | （2．5） | 1.9 | （0．4） | 12.4 | （5．4） | －11．8 | （6．1） | －1．0 | （3．7） | 0.5 | （0．6） |
|  | Thailand | 17.5 | （2．7） | 47.7 | （4．1） | 34.5 | （3．6） | 0.4 | （0．3） | 21.1 | （2．6） | 42.8 | （3．7） | 34.7 | （4．0） | 1.4 | （0．8） | 3.6 | （3．8） | －4．9 | （5．6） | 0.2 | （5．3） | 1.0 | （0．8） |
|  | Tunisia | 19.2 | （3．2） | 64.9 | （3．8） | 15.9 | （2．8） | 0.0 |  | 55.9 | （4．0） | 43.2 | （4．1） | 0.9 | （0．8） | 0.0 | c | 36.7 | （5．1） | －21．7 | （5．6） | －15．0 | （2．9） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Uruguay | 63.4 | （3．7） | 35.6 | （3．7） | 0.7 | （0．3） | 0.3 | （0．3） | 79.8 | （2．7） | 18.0 | （2．5） | 2.2 | （1．2） | 0.0 | c | 16.4 | （4．6） | －17．6 | （4．5） | 1.5 | （1．2） | －0．3 | c |

Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
StatLink 唡而相 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957517

# RESULTS FOR REGIONS WITHIN COUNTRIES 

[Part 1/2]
Grade repetition, by region
Table B2.IV. 1 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |
|  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U Australian capital territory | 94.4 | (0.8) | 5.6 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 99.6 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 0.0 | C | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (0.9) |
| - New South Wales | 94.0 | (0.4) | 5.7 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 6.7 | (0.5) |
| Northern territory | 90.9 | (1.5) | 8.4 | (1.6) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 98.1 | (0.4) | 1.5 | (0.4) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 97.1 | (1.8) | 0.0 | C | 2.9 | (1.8) | 10.5 | (1.5) |
| Queensland | 91.8 | (0.5) | 7.9 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.6 | (0.3) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 9.2 | (0.6) |
| South Australia | 90.6 | (0.8) | 8.8 | (0.7) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 98.7 | (0.3) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 100.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 9.9 | (0.8) |
| Tasmania | 94.3 | (0.8) | 5.3 | (0.8) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 98.0 | (0.5) | 1.8 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 6.7 | (0.9) |
| Victoria | 93.5 | (0.5) | 6.3 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.8 | (0.3) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | C | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 7.2 | (0.6) |
| Western Australia | 95.2 | (0.5) | 4.6 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.2 | (0.4) | 1.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (0.6) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 82.4 | (0.8) | 16.5 | (0.7) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 91.4 | (0.6) | 8.2 | (0.6) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 94.9 | (0.4) | 5.1 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 27.4 | (0.8) |
| French community | 75.3 | (1.2) | 19.7 | (1.0) | 4.9 | (0.5) | 72.1 | (1.1) | 25.7 | (1.1) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 84.5 | (0.8) | 15.3 | (0.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 47.8 | (1.1) |
| German-speaking community | 85.6 | (1.0) | 12.9 | (1.0) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 85.2 | (1.2) | 14.0 | (1.2) | 0.8 | (0.3) | 91.6 | (0.9) | 8.4 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | 31.7 | (1.1) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 94.8 | (0.9) | 5.0 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.2 | (0.7) | 1.7 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 6.6 | (1.2) |
| British Columbia | 98.7 | (0.4) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.5 | (0.3) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.5) |
| Manitoba | 95.1 | (0.9) | 4.7 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 97.6 | (0.3) | 2.1 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.5 | (0.3) | 1.2 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 7.1 | (0.9) |
| New Brunswick | 92.8 | (0.6) | 7.1 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 97.1 | (0.5) | 2.8 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 9.6 | (0.7) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 97.6 | (0.7) | 2.4 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.7 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.5) |
| Nova Scotia | 95.8 | (2.0) | 4.0 | (2.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 96.3 | (2.0) | 3.5 | (2.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.1 | (0.1) | 6.9 | (3.3) |
| Ontario | 97.5 | (0.4) | 2.3 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.6 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.0 | (0.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 3.7 | (0.4) |
| Prince Edward Island | 95.5 | (0.4) | 4.4 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.3) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 99.6 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 5.0 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 91.5 | (0.8) | 7.5 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.3) | 86.0 | (0.9) | 11.8 | (0.8) | 2.2 | (0.4) | 99.1 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 20.4 | (1.1) |
| Saskatchewan | 96.2 | (0.4) | 3.6 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 98.3 | (0.3) | 1.5 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 99.3 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 5.2 | (0.6) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 99.7 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 92.6 | (0.9) | 6.8 | (0.7) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 91.6 | (0.9) | 8.1 | (0.9) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 14.8 | (1.4) |
| Basilicata | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 96.3 | (0.8) | 3.5 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 92.6 | (0.9) | 7.4 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | 10.9 | (1.0) |
| Bolzano | 97.8 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 91.9 | (1.1) | 7.5 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 86.2 | (0.7) | 13.8 | (0.7) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 21.3 | (0.9) |
| Calabria | 98.5 | (0.5) | 1.3 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 93.7 | (1.1) | 4.9 | (1.1) | 1.3 | (0.4) | 95.4 | (0.8) | 4.6 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 10.9 | (1.3) |
| Campania | 99.5 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 95.4 | (1.0) | 3.6 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.6) | 91.4 | (1.0) | 8.6 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c | 12.2 | (1.3) |
| Emilia Romagna | 98.1 | (0.3) | 1.8 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 91.2 | (0.8) | 7.6 | (0.7) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 87.7 | (0.9) | 12.3 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 20.6 | (1.2) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 98.7 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 90.2 | (1.6) | 7.7 | (1.0) | 2.0 | (2.0) | 89.0 | (0.9) | 10.9 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 20.4 | (2.1) |
| Lazio | 98.9 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 93.0 | (1.0) | 5.0 | (0.7) | 2.0 | (0.7) | 90.4 | (1.0) | 9.5 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 16.3 | (1.5) |
| Liguria | 97.8 | (0.6) | 2.0 | (0.6) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 89.4 | (1.6) | 8.7 | (1.5) | 1.9 | (0.6) | 90.0 | (1.6) | 9.9 | (1.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 20.3 | (2.5) |
| Lombardia | 99.4 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 94.1 | (0.8) | 5.3 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 87.2 | (1.3) | 12.8 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | 17.9 | (1.6) |
| Marche | 98.7 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 91.6 | (1.2) | 6.8 | (1.0) | 1.6 | (0.7) | 90.2 | (1.4) | 9.3 | (1.3) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 17.4 | (2.0) |
| Molise | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 93.9 | (0.7) | 5.3 | (0.7) | 0.8 | (0.1) | 93.4 | (0.8) | 6.5 | (0.8) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 12.2 | (0.8) |
| Piemonte | 99.0 | (0.4) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 89.4 | (1.0) | 8.7 | (0.8) | 1.9 | (0.3) | 88.7 | (1.0) | 11.3 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c | 21.1 | (1.6) |
| Puglia | 99.3 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 95.5 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (0.6) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 93.2 | (0.9) | 6.7 | (0.9) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 10.7 | (1.1) |
| Sardegna | 99.1 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 86.0 | (2.0) | 8.9 | (1.8) | 5.1 | (1.1) | 84.2 | (2.2) | 15.4 | (2.0) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 26.9 | (2.9) |
| Sicilia | 98.7 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 90.7 | (1.7) | 6.2 | (1.0) | 3.1 | (0.9) | 90.8 | (1.0) | 8.9 | (1.0) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 17.7 | (1.9) |
| Toscana | 98.7 | (0.2) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 91.2 | (1.2) | 7.6 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 87.0 | (1.1) | 13.0 | (1.1) | 0.0 | C | 20.7 | (1.5) |
| Trento | 99.1 | (0.4) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 93.8 | (1.0) | 6.1 | (1.0) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 88.8 | (1.0) | 11.2 | (1.0) | 0.0 | c | 16.8 | (1.5) |
| Umbria | 99.0 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 92.6 | (1.4) | 6.4 | (1.2) | 1.0 | (0.4) | 93.2 | (0.8) | 6.8 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 14.0 | (1.5) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 96.8 | (0.7) | 2.6 | (0.6) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 82.4 | (1.1) | 13.8 | (1.2) | 3.8 | (0.5) | 81.7 | (1.2) | 18.3 | (1.2) | 0.0 | c | 33.9 | (1.1) |
| Veneto | 98.7 | (0.4) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 91.5 | (1.9) | 7.9 | (1.8) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 89.1 | (1.3) | 10.9 | (1.3) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 19.1 | (2.3) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 87.1 | (3.9) | 11.8 | (3.5) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 96.0 | (1.4) | 3.6 | (1.2) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 99.4 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (4.4) |
| Baja California | 89.3 | (2.3) | 10.1 | (2.4) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 98.3 | (0.6) | 1.7 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 98.2 | (0.8) | 1.8 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 12.9 | (2.1) |
| Baja California Sur | 87.3 | (2.5) | 11.6 | (2.2) | 1.0 | (0.5) | 96.5 | (0.9) | 3.2 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 99.4 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 15.1 | (2.7) |
| Campeche | 76.8 | (2.2) | 19.3 | (2.1) | 4.0 | (0.7) | 94.1 | (1.4) | 5.6 | (1.4) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 98.8 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 26.6 | (2.0) |
| Chiapas | 80.5 | (3.1) | 16.5 | (2.9) | 3.0 | (0.6) | 96.6 | (1.0) | 2.9 | (0.8) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 98.2 | (0.9) | 1.5 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 22.0 | (3.3) |
| Chihuahua | 83.5 | (2.5) | 15.1 | (2.3) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 96.0 | (0.8) | 3.8 | (0.9) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.7 | (0.6) | 1.3 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 19.9 | (2.3) |
| Coahuila | 93.7 | (1.7) | 6.1 | (1.6) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 97.3 | (1.0) | 2.5 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 98.4 | (0.7) | 1.5 | (0.7) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 9.5 | (2.2) |
| Colima | 82.3 | (2.1) | 15.1 | (1.8) | 2.6 | (0.4) | 94.3 | (1.4) | 4.8 | (1.1) | 0.9 | (0.4) | 99.4 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 21.5 | (2.0) |
| Distrito Federal | 94.7 | (1.8) | 4.7 | (1.5) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 94.6 | (0.5) | 5.0 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 99.2 | (0.4) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 10.9 | (1.9) |
| Durango | 89.7 | (2.3) | 9.1 | (1.9) | 1.1 | (0.7) | 97.6 | (1.2) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (0.5) | 99.2 | (0.6) | 0.8 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 12.3 | (2.5) |
| Guanajuato | 84.9 | (2.6) | 13.1 | (2.2) | 1.9 | (0.7) | 98.6 | (0.5) | 1.2 | (0.6) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 99.2 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 16.2 | (2.7) |
| Guerrero | 76.8 | (2.7) | 19.7 | (2.2) | 3.5 | (0.8) | 95.5 | (1.2) | 3.2 | (0.9) | 1.3 | (0.5) | 97.3 | (1.2) | 2.2 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 26.0 | (2.8) |
| Hidalgo | 82.6 | (3.0) | 14.5 | (2.6) | 3.0 | (0.7) | 97.3 | (0.9) | 2.3 | (0.8) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 98.4 | (0.5) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | 20.1 | (3.3) |
| Jalisco | 87.4 | (2.1) | 11.0 | (1.8) | 1.6 | (0.4) | 97.0 | (0.7) | 2.8 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 98.2 | (0.5) | 1.6 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.0) | 15.5 | (2.0) |
| Mexico | 90.5 | (2.2) | 9.3 | (2.1) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 93.5 | (2.0) | 6.2 | (1.8) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 99.2 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 15.1 | (2.9) |
| Morelos | 94.6 | (1.1) | 5.1 | (1.0) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 97.6 | (0.7) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 7.7 | (1.5) |
| Nayarit | 92.8 | (1.7) | 6.6 | (1.7) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 97.4 | (0.8) | 2.2 | (0.8) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 98.7 | (0.6) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 8.7 | (2.0) |
| Nuevo León | 92.2 | (1.8) | 7.2 | (1.8) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 98.9 | (0.5) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | 98.2 | (0.4) | 1.8 | (0.4) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 9.7 | (1.9) |
| Puebla | 85.8 | (2.6) | 11.2 | (1.9) | 3.0 | (1.0) | 98.7 | (0.4) | 1.3 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 99.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 15.3 | (2.7) |
| Querétaro | 88.8 | (2.6) | 9.6 | (1.9) | 1.5 | (0.9) | 95.3 | (1.5) | 4.6 | (1.4) | 0.1 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.2) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 15.0 | (3.2) |
| Quintana Roo | 81.2 | (2.0) | 15.1 | (1.6) | 3.7 | (1.0) | 96.6 | (0.7) | 3.3 | (0.7) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.1 | (0.6) | 1.8 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 21.2 | (2.0) |
| San Luis Potosí | 84.0 | (2.8) | 14.4 | (2.5) | 1.6 | (0.8) | 96.4 | (0.8) | 2.7 | (0.7) | 0.9 | (0.5) | 99.6 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 18.0 | (2.8) |
| Sinaloa | 87.5 | (1.9) | 11.6 | (1.7) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 96.0 | (1.0) | 3.9 | (1.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.3 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 15.6 | (2.1) |
| Tabasco | 85.2 | (1.9) | 13.4 | (1.8) | 1.5 | (0.4) | 96.4 | (1.2) | 3.2 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.4) | 99.3 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 17.2 | (2.4) |
| Tamaulipas | 92.3 | (1.8) | 7.3 | (1.7) | 0.4 | (0.4) | 97.2 | (0.4) | 2.1 | (0.6) | 0.6 | (0.5) | 99.1 | (0.4) | 0.7 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 10.2 | (1.8) |
| Tlaxcala | 93.5 | (1.0) | 6.3 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 97.7 | (0.5) | 2.3 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c | 99.7 | (0.2) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 8.6 | (0.9) |
| Veracruz | 77.1 | (2.1) | 20.6 | (1.9) | 2.2 | (0.3) | 96.4 | (1.1) | 3.4 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 99.5 | (0.3) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 25.0 | (2.5) |
| Yucatán | 73.3 | (2.6) | 24.2 | (2.4) | 2.5 | (0.7) | 95.3 | (0.8) | 4.3 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 97.7 | (0.6) | 2.1 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 29.4 | (2.2) |
| Zacatecas | 87.2 | (1.6) | 11.8 | (1.3) | 1.0 | (0.4) | 96.0 | (0.9) | 4.0 | (0.9) | 0.0 | C | 99.4 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 15.9 | (1.7) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.2 for national data
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Grade repetition, by region
Table B2.IV. 1 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Percentage of students reporting that they have repeated a grade in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary school |  |  |  |  |  | Lower secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Upper secondary school |  |  |  |  |  | Primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school |  |
|  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  | Never |  | Once |  | Twice or more |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 79.1 | (4.3) | 15.5 | (3.2) | 5.4 | (1.2) | 83.3 | (3.5) | 15.0 | (3.0) | 1.8 | (0.8) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c\| | 0.0 | c | 29.9 | (5.5) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 83.9 | (1.4) | 14.8 | (1.2) | 1.2 | (0.4) | 69.1 | (1.6) | 27.3 | (1.4) | 3.7 | (0.8) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 36.7 | (1.4) |
| Aragon* | 83.6 | (1.4) | 15.4 | (1.4) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 69.4 | (1.7) | 27.9 | (1.4) | 2.7 | (0.6) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 36.1 | (1.9) |
| Asturias* | 88.9 | (1.0) | 10.6 | (1.0) | 0.5 | (0.2) | 76.6 | (1.5) | 22.4 | (1.4) | 0.9 | (0.3) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 27.4 | (1.5) |
| Balearic Islands ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 79.2 | (1.4) | 19.6 | (1.4) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 69.1 | (1.7) | 28.1 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 39.1 | (1.8) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 90.9 | (0.6) | 8.5 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 84.0 | (0.7) | 15.0 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 20.8 | (0.9) |
| Cantabria* | 86.3 | (1.2) | 13.1 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 72.4 | (1.8) | 26.2 | (1.6) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 32.3 | (1.9) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 86.7 | (1.1) | 12.3 | (0.9) | 1.0 | (0.3) | 69.7 | (1.8) | 27.5 | (1.6) | 2.8 | (0.5) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 34.5 | (1.7) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 93.6 | (1.0) | 6.0 | (1.0) | 0.3 | (0.1) | 83.0 | (1.9) | 16.3 | (1.9) | 0.7 | (0.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 20.6 | (2.0) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 82.1 | (1.4) | 16.4 | (1.4) | 1.4 | (0.4) | 61.5 | (1.6) | 34.1 | (1.5) | 4.4 | (0.6) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 42.9 | (1.6) |
| Galicia* | 86.8 | (1.2) | 12.1 | (1.1) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 71.8 | (1.8) | 25.5 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.5) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 33.0 | (1.9) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 90.1 | (0.7) | 9.0 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 68.9 | (0.7) | 27.9 | (0.8) | 3.2 | (0.5) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 34.0 | (0.6) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 86.9 | (1.3) | 12.6 | (1.3) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 71.6 | (1.5) | 25.8 | (1.4) | 2.7 | (0.4) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 32.4 | (1.6) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 77.3 | (1.3) | 21.6 | (1.2) | 1.1 | (0.3) | 64.5 | (1.3) | 32.2 | (1.1) | 3.3 | (0.7) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 42.5 | (1.3) |
| Navarre* | 88.4 | (0.9) | 11.3 | (0.9) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 80.1 | (1.3) | 19.1 | (1.2) | 0.7 | (0.2) | c | c | c | c | c | c | 25.3 | (1.2) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 98.0 | (0.3) | 1.9 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.1) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.0) | 99.4 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.3) |
| Northern Ireland | 98.2 | (0.3) | 1.6 | (0.4) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 99.0 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.5) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 98.2 | (0.2) | 1.6 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.1 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 2.8 | (0.3) |
| Wales | 98.0 | (0.3) | 1.8 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.2 | (0.2) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 99.4 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.3) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 90.6 | (1.0) | 9.0 | (0.9) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 96.3 | (0.6) | 3.6 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.4 | (0.3) | 1.6 | (0.3) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 11.4 | (1.2) |
| Florida* | 80.9 | (1.2) | 17.8 | (1.0) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 94.3 | (0.6) | 5.4 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 98.0 | (0.3) | 2.0 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 22.0 | (1.1) |
| Massachusetts* | 95.5 | (0.6) | 4.4 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 96.4 | (0.6) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 0.2 | (0.1) | 98.1 | (0.4) | 1.8 | (0.4) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 6.6 | (0.7) |


| Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| § Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 88.7 | (1.6) | 9.4 | (1.4) | 1.9 | (0.5) | 80.4 | (2.2) | 17.4 | (1.9) | 2.1 | (0.6) | 97.9 | (0.5) | 1.5 | (0.5) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 25.4 | (2.8) |
| Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 69.8 | (3.4) | 26.7 | (2.7) | 3.5 | (1.0) | 90.1 | (2.0) | 8.6 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (0.6) | 96.4 | (1.4) | 3.6 | (1.4) | 0.0 | c | 35.7 | (3.5) |
| Alagoas | 63.3 | (3.1) | 26.0 | (1.8) | 10.7 | (2.4) | 75.1 | (3.9) | 17.1 | (2.0) | 7.7 | (2.4) | 93.5 | (1.3) | 6.5 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | 50.1 | (3.7) |
| Amapá | 69.0 | (4.2) | 25.1 | (2.6) | 5.9 | (1.9) | 86.6 | (2.6) | 11.6 | (2.1) | 1.7 | (0.7) | 95.7 | (1.1) | 4.3 | (1.1) | 0.0 | c | 37.3 | (3.7) |
| Amazonas | 70.7 | (3.0) | 23.2 | (2.5) | 6.1 | (0.9) | 77.1 | (3.2) | 17.6 | (2.7) | 5.3 | (1.2) | 94.5 | (1.6) | 4.1 | (1.0) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 42.7 | (3.8) |
| Bahia | 67.7 | (3.9) | 24.9 | (2.9) | 7.5 | (2.2) | 77.5 | (5.8) | 20.2 | (5.4) | 2.4 | (1.1) | 95.4 | (1.6) | 4.4 | (1.5) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 46.3 | (4.6) |
| Ceará | 76.2 | (3.5) | 20.7 | (3.4) | 3.1 | (0.7) | 83.4 | (2.3) | 12.7 | (1.9) | 3.9 | (0.9) | 92.9 | (1.5) | 6.8 | (1.4) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 36.4 | (4.0) |
| Espírito Santo | 85.2 | (2.3) | 11.5 | (2.3) | 3.3 | (0.8) | 79.0 | (2.8) | 15.5 | (2.4) | 5.5 | (1.3) | 87.8 | (1.9) | 12.2 | (1.9) | 0.0 | c | 36.0 | (3.0) |
| Federal District | 77.5 | (3.6) | 15.0 | (2.2) | 7.5 | (2.2) | 79.9 | (2.0) | 15.1 | (1.6) | 5.0 | (0.7) | 92.7 | (1.1) | 7.1 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 37.9 | (3.2) |
| Goiás | 80.3 | (3.7) | 13.4 | (2.3) | 6.3 | (2.5) | 79.0 | (3.7) | 14.9 | (2.6) | 6.1 | (1.4) | 93.1 | (1.2) | 6.4 | (1.3) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 37.0 | (4.7) |
| Maranhão | 75.0 | (3.7) | 21.0 | (3.3) | 3.9 | (1.5) | 78.1 | (4.2) | 17.7 | (3.7) | 4.1 | (1.3) | 91.9 | (1.9) | 7.6 | (1.8) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 39.9 | (4.5) |
| Mato Grosso | 74.1 | (3.0) | 20.8 | (2.5) | 5.2 | (1.5) | 85.2 | (2.8) | 11.7 | (1.7) | 3.1 | (1.4) | 89.7 | (1.5) | 10.1 | (1.5) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 37.5 | (3.2) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 77.2 | (3.1) | 15.9 | (2.1) | 6.9 | (1.3) | 74.1 | (3.3) | 17.1 | (1.6) | 8.8 | (2.0) | 88.3 | (1.8) | 11.7 | (1.8) | 0.0 | c | 43.7 | (3.7) |
| Minas Gerais | 78.6 | (3.1) | 16.2 | (2.6) | 5.2 | (1.3) | 78.4 | (3.2) | 16.4 | (2.1) | 5.2 | (1.4) | 95.9 | (1.0) | 3.9 | (1.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 36.9 | (4.1) |
| Pará | 67.4 | (4.0) | 25.0 | (2.9) | 7.6 | (1.6) | 74.6 | (2.8) | 19.4 | (2.4) | 5.9 | (1.6) | 97.1 | (0.8) | 2.9 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 44.7 | (4.1) |
| Paraíba | 80.4 | (2.2) | 15.5 | (1.8) | 4.1 | (0.9) | 79.1 | (3.1) | 15.3 | (2.3) | 5.6 | (1.2) | 92.5 | (1.3) | 7.3 | (1.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 36.7 | (2.6) |
| Paraná | 76.2 | (3.0) | 18.1 | (2.0) | 5.7 | (1.2) | 76.6 | (2.8) | 15.3 | (2.2) | 8.1 | (1.5) | 88.8 | (1.9) | 11.0 | (2.0) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 42.0 | (3.4) |
| Pernambuco | 67.7 | (2.3) | 26.4 | (2.2) | 5.9 | (1.5) | 77.8 | (1.9) | 17.3 | (2.0) | 4.9 | (1.0) | 93.6 | (1.0) | 6.1 | (1.1) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 45.8 | (2.7) |
| Piauí | 75.4 | (2.7) | 20.6 | (2.6) | 4.0 | (1.0) | 75.4 | (2.8) | 20.5 | (2.5) | 4.1 | (0.8) | 93.6 | (0.9) | 6.4 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c | 41.4 | (2.8) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 86.0 | (2.9) | 11.1 | (2.4) | 2.8 | (0.8) | 78.3 | (3.5) | 16.5 | (3.0) | 5.2 | (1.6) | 92.8 | (1.1) | 6.7 | (1.2) | 0.5 | (0.4) | 32.4 | (4.1) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 70.1 | (3.3) | 22.3 | (2.5) | 7.6 | (1.6) | 68.7 | (4.2) | 19.6 | (2.2) | 11.8 | (2.4) | 92.5 | (1.4) | 6.2 | (1.5) | 1.3 | (0.7) | 49.2 | (4.4) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 78.4 | (3.5) | 13.9 | (1.9) | 7.7 | (1.9) | 76.6 | (3.6) | 15.2 | (1.5) | 8.2 | (2.6) | 87.2 | (2.3) | 12.5 | (2.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 40.5 | (3.4) |
| Rondônia | 73.2 | (2.8) | 20.2 | (2.2) | 6.5 | (1.2) | 66.6 | (3.9) | 23.0 | (2.9) | 10.4 | (1.5) | 92.1 | (1.2) | 7.9 | (1.2) | 0.0 | c | 48.3 | (3.5) |
| Roraima | 71.2 | (4.2) | 20.6 | (3.4) | 8.2 | (1.4) | 73.6 | (1.8) | 18.7 | (1.5) | 7.7 | (1.0) | 91.2 | (1.7) | 8.0 | (1.6) | 0.8 | (0.5) | 45.8 | (3.3) |
| Santa Catarina | 79.7 | (3.4) | 13.8 | (2.2) | 6.4 | (1.5) | 80.0 | (2.4) | 15.7 | (2.2) | 4.3 | (0.9) | 93.1 | (1.2) | 6.3 | (1.2) | 0.5 | (0.3) | 35.1 | (3.7) |
| São Paulo | 87.5 | (1.3) | 10.1 | (0.9) | 2.4 | (0.7) | 87.7 | (1.3) | 9.3 | (0.9) | 3.0 | (0.6) | 91.7 | (1.0) | 7.8 | (1.0) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 25.9 | (2.0) |
| Sergipe | 72.5 | (4.4) | 18.2 | (2.5) | 9.4 | (2.6) | 67.8 | (4.8) | 21.2 | (3.2) | 11.0 | (2.0) | 93.0 | (1.8) | 7.0 | (1.8) | 0.0 | c | 49.4 | (5.1) |
| Tocantins | 79.0 | (2.4) | 16.5 | (1.7) | 4.6 | (1.5) | 78.9 | (2.9) | 15.2 | (2.2) | 5.9 | (1.4) | 89.4 | (1.6) | 9.0 | (1.6) | 1.7 | (0.5) | 36.4 | (3.1) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 83.9 | (1.2) | 13.9 | (1.2) | 2.2 | (0.5) | 71.3 | (1.8) | 21.3 | (1.4) | 7.4 | (0.8) | 94.2 | (0.8) | 5.4 | (0.8) | 0.4 | (0.2) | 37.4 | (1.7) |
| Cali | 79.2 | (1.9) | 17.4 | (1.7) | 3.3 | (0.6) | 75.1 | (1.6) | 21.1 | (1.3) | 3.9 | (0.6) | 97.7 | (0.6) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 35.8 | (2.0) |
| Manizales | 77.4 | (1.5) | 17.9 | (1.5) | 4.7 | (0.8) | 71.8 | (1.5) | 21.5 | (1.5) | 6.8 | (0.9) | 94.2 | (0.8) | 5.8 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 41.0 | (1.7) |
| Medellin | 81.9 | (2.3) | 14.2 | (1.9) | 3.9 | (0.8) | 70.9 | (2.3) | 21.8 | (1.9) | 7.4 | (1.1) | 95.6 | (0.7) | 4.0 | (0.6) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 38.4 | (2.5) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 97.3 | (0.5) | 2.6 | (0.5) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 98.4 | (0.3) | 1.0 | (0.3) | 0.6 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c\| | 3.8 | (0.7) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 91.1 | (0.7) | 7.9 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.2) | 92.4 | (0.7) | 6.4 | (0.6) | 1.3 | (0.2) | 98.2 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 13.3 | (0.9) |
| Ajman | 88.7 | (4.6) | 9.6 | (3.8) | 1.7 | (0.8) | 92.5 | (3.5) | 6.9 | (3.3) | 0.6 | (0.3) | 97.9 | (0.8) | 1.8 | (0.7) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 15.6 | (6.5) |
| Dubai ${ }^{*}$ | 94.1 | (0.3) | 5.2 | (0.3) | 0.7 | (0.1) | 95.1 | (0.3) | 4.5 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.1) | 98.8 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 9.8 | (0.4) |
| Fujairah | 88.8 | (1.7) | 10.1 | (1.5) | 1.1 | (0.5) | 94.3 | (1.3) | 4.3 | (1.0) | 1.4 | (0.5) | 98.0 | (0.9) | 1.2 | (0.7) | 0.7 | (0.4) | 13.9 | (2.1) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 91.7 | (2.1) | 7.0 | (1.9) | 1.3 | (0.4) | 92.2 | (2.7) | 6.6 | (2.3) | 1.3 | (0.4) | 98.0 | (0.4) | 1.7 | (0.5) | 0.3 | (0.2) | 14.3 | (3.3) |
| Sharjah | 93.0 | (2.4) | 6.2 | (2.1) | 0.8 | (0.4) | 96.7 | (1.4) | 2.9 | (1.2) | 0.4 | (0.3) | 98.4 | (0.4) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 0.2 | (0.2) | 9.7 | (3.1) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 82.7 | (1.6) | 13.7 | (1.5) | 3.6 | (0.9) | 85.9 | (1.4) | 11.3 | (1.5) | 2.8 | (0.6) | 98.0 | (0.9) | 1.7 | (0.9) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 23.9 | (1.5) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.2 for national data.

[Part 1/6]
School admissions policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 2 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following factors are "never", "sometimes" or "always" considered for admission to school: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Residence in a particular area |  |  |  |  |  | Students' records of academic performance |  |  |  |  |  | Recommendations of feeder schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 24.9 | (0.8) | 22.3 | (0.8) | 52.8 | (0.9) | 33.2 | (0.9) | 42.3 | (1.1) | 24.5 | (0.9) | 43.8 | (1.1) | 38.6 | (1.2) | 17.6 | (0.8) |
| - New South Wales | 28.8 | (2.9) | 17.4 | (2.9) | 53.8 | (2.8) | 26.3 | (3.6) | 32.5 | (3.1) | 41.2 | (3.6) | 18.1 | (3.1) | 39.9 | (4.4) | 42.1 | (3.8) |
| Northern territory | 54.3 | (3.4) | 6.0 | (0.7) | 39.7 | (3.0) | 31.3 | (5.5) | 44.8 | (9.8) | 23.9 | (8.9) | 24.5 | (5.9) | 52.4 | (9.9) | 23.2 | (8.8) |
| Queensland | 49.1 | (3.7) | 24.1 | (3.8) | 26.8 | (3.4) | 28.3 | (3.7) | 41.5 | (3.9) | 30.3 | (4.0) | 28.0 | (3.2) | 47.1 | (4.1) | 24.9 | (3.6) |
| South Australia | 36.3 | (4.1) | 22.7 | (4.0) | 41.0 | (3.0) | 30.9 | (4.0) | 40.7 | (4.9) | 28.3 | (4.8) | 24.0 | (4.4) | 41.8 | (5.3) | 34.2 | (4.7) |
| Tasmania | 32.9 | (1.1) | 13.5 | (0.9) | 53.6 | (1.3) | 64.0 | (2.1) | 16.3 | (1.3) | 19.8 | (1.8) | 31.2 | (1.9) | 40.3 | (1.7) | 28.6 | (1.5) |
| Victoria | 29.1 | (3.4) | 22.2 | (3.4) | 48.8 | (3.9) | 19.4 | (3.6) | 52.0 | (4.9) | 28.6 | (3.6) | 21.3 | (3.1) | 47.7 | (4.1) | 31.0 | (3.8) |
| Western Australia | 44.2 | (3.9) | 13.8 | (3.1) | 42.1 | (3.6) | 28.0 | (4.4) | 40.9 | (4.2) | 31.0 | (4.2) | 28.8 | (4.8) | 42.7 | (5.0) | 28.6 | (4.2) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 91.9 | (2.6) | 6.5 | (2.3) | 1.5 | (1.2) | 36.7 | (3.6) | 30.9 | (3.8) | 32.4 | (3.7) | 48.6 | (3.8) | 42.8 | (4.0) | 8.7 | (2.2) |
| French community | 69.0 | (4.7) | 29.7 | (4.6) | 1.4 | (0.8) | 57.3 | (4.8) | 26.6 | (4.3) | 16.2 | (3.2) | 66.6 | (4.2) | 31.4 | (4.2) | 2.0 | (1.4) |
| German-speaking community | 71.1 | (0.3) | 27.6 | (0.2) | 1.3 | (0.3) | 20.3 | (0.2) | 42.5 | (0.3) | 37.2 | (0.2) | 34.5 | (0.3) | 52.1 | (0.3) | 13.3 | (0.2) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 18.8 | (4.3) | 20.0 | (4.2) | 61.1 | (5.0) | 40.9 | (6.0) | 39.0 | (5.3) | 20.1 | (4.5) | 30.3 | (4.9) | 43.8 | (5.4) | 25.9 | (4.9) |
| British Columbia | 26.4 | (4.2) | 9.7 | (3.7) | 63.9 | (4.7) | 47.4 | (5.8) | 34.1 | (5.8) | 18.5 | (4.7) | 34.7 | (5.8) | 39.5 | (6.1) | 25.8 | (5.8) |
| Manitoba | 10.8 | (2.3) | 15.7 | (2.8) | 73.5 | (3.0) | 38.9 | (2.8) | 44.0 | (3.1) | 17.1 | (2.1) | 27.8 | (3.2) | 48.1 | (3.3) | 24.1 | (2.2) |
| New Brunswick | 15.2 | (3.4) | 17.9 | (1.3) | 66.9 | (3.0) | 69.5 | (3.1) | 19.3 | (1.6) | 11.1 | (3.3) | 58.0 | (2.9) | 27.1 | (1.7) | 14.9 | (3.2) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 43.6 | (3.0) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 51.1 | (2.8) | 69.0 | (4.3) | 4.2 | (0.7) | 26.8 | (4.3) | 49.7 | (4.5) | 23.1 | (1.9) | 27.3 | (3.7) |
| Nova Scotia | 22.6 | (11.3) | 4.7 | (1.3) | 72.6 | (10.6) | 47.2 | (8.0) | 20.6 | (4.5) | 32.2 | (10.2) | 40.9 | (7.6) | 24.2 | (5.3) | 34.9 | (9.6) |
| Ontario | 8.0 | (2.7) | 5.3 | (2.3) | 86.7 | (3.5) | 41.6 | (5.4) | 30.1 | (4.5) | 28.3 | (4.2) | 31.8 | (5.4) | 28.7 | (4.4) | 39.5 | (5.5) |
| Prince Edward Island | 30.7 | (0.4) | 3.8 | (0.1) | 65.5 | (0.4) | 62.4 | (0.4) | 4.9 | (0.2) | 32.7 | (0.4) | 32.0 | (0.5) | 24.2 | (0.4) | 43.9 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 26.0 | (3.6) | 22.3 | (3.4) | 51.7 | (4.0) | 32.9 | (4.3) | 32.2 | (3.9) | 34.9 | (2.7) | 38.1 | (4.5) | 42.9 | (4.3) | 19.0 | (3.2) |
| Saskatchewan | 38.1 | (3.3) | 32.5 | (2.4) | 29.4 | (3.6) | 45.9 | (3.4) | 34.8 | (2.2) | 19.3 | (2.6) | 36.2 | (3.8) | 37.7 | (2.8) | 26.1 | (2.8) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 41.4 | (6.2) | 32.3 | (6.1) | 26.3 | (5.7) | 13.6 | (4.8) | 12.4 | (4.8) | 74.0 | (6.2) | 18.2 | (4.4) | 31.0 | (5.6) | 50.7 | (6.4) |
| Basilicata | 39.1 | (6.1) | 38.6 | (5.3) | 22.2 | (5.3) | 23.4 | (4.3) | 22.0 | (4.4) | 54.6 | (5.0) | 25.8 | (5.3) | 36.9 | (5.1) | 37.3 | (4.5) |
| Bolzano | 62.0 | (0.8) | 25.8 | (0.7) | 12.2 | (1.3) | 69.9 | (1.0) | 14.8 | (0.5) | 15.4 | (1.1) | 77.0 | (0.6) | 13.8 | (0.4) | 9.1 | (0.4) |
| Calabria | 27.1 | (8.0) | 35.9 | (7.9) | 37.0 | (6.7) | 24.9 | (6.0) | 25.8 | (5.5) | 49.3 | (6.9) | 28.1 | (7.7) | 34.9 | (6.3) | 36.9 | (8.6) |
| Campania | 44.2 | (9.4) | 27.8 | (9.4) | 28.0 | (6.8) | 20.3 | (5.8) | 23.4 | (6.6) | 56.3 | (9.1) | 29.8 | (6.1) | 32.8 | (7.3) | 37.4 | (9.0) |
| Emilia Romagna | 45.7 | (7.3) | 26.3 | (7.3) | 28.0 | (6.6) | 19.6 | (6.9) | 17.7 | (6.5) | 62.6 | (8.7) | 12.1 | (5.6) | 13.4 | (4.4) | 74.5 | (6.4) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 38.0 | (5.8) | 31.7 | (4.6) | 30.4 | (5.9) | 10.7 | (4.2) | 31.0 | (5.9) | 58.3 | (6.7) | 12.3 | (4.6) | 25.0 | (4.9) | 62.7 | (5.1) |
| Lazio | 34.0 | (8.7) | 25.6 | (7.1) | 40.4 | (6.8) | 17.6 | (6.1) | 12.1 | (3.6) | 70.3 | (6.8) | 21.9 | (6.8) | 36.2 | (6.8) | 41.9 | (6.7) |
| Liguria | 37.2 | (5.7) | 43.5 | (6.5) | 19.2 | (5.6) | 23.3 | (6.4) | 22.6 | (5.5) | 54.1 | (6.9) | 17.5 | (4.1) | 46.3 | (6.3) | 36.2 | (6.5) |
| Lombardia | 23.2 | (6.7) | 43.3 | (7.7) | 33.4 | (5.4) | 25.4 | (5.8) | 27.7 | (7.5) | 46.9 | (7.6) | 18.2 | (5.7) | 19.9 | (7.4) | 62.0 | (7.7) |
| Marche | 42.4 | (7.3) | 36.8 | (6.8) | 20.8 | (5.6) | 17.1 | (4.2) | 27.1 | (5.2) | 55.8 | (6.6) | 13.8 | (2.9) | 35.1 | (6.1) | 51.1 | (6.3) |
| Molise | 41.5 | (0.9) | 29.2 | (0.8) | 29.3 | (0.8) | 7.9 | (0.6) | 31.8 | (0.9) | 60.3 | (0.9) | 20.0 | (0.9) | 44.8 | (1.0) | 35.2 | (0.9) |
| Piemonte | 36.8 | (6.2) | 46.4 | (6.6) | 16.8 | (5.6) | 29.8 | (9.3) | 22.6 | (6.8) | 47.6 | (8.6) | 15.2 | (5.1) | 34.0 | (6.9) | 50.7 | (8.4) |
| Puglia | 32.1 | (5.7) | 39.3 | (5.7) | 28.7 | (6.3) | 17.8 | (5.4) | 24.7 | (6.4) | 57.5 | (7.8) | 24.9 | (6.5) | 38.2 | (7.2) | 36.9 | (5.2) |
| Sardegna | 33.9 | (6.6) | 34.6 | (7.7) | 31.5 | (7.0) | 26.5 | (5.5) | 10.0 | (4.2) | 63.4 | (6.5) | 31.1 | (5.8) | 29.8 | (7.7) | 39.1 | (6.6) |
| Sicilia | 40.8 | (7.0) | 34.3 | (6.0) | 24.9 | (4.8) | 23.6 | (5.1) | 19.2 | (6.1) | 57.1 | (6.2) | 20.2 | (5.0) | 36.1 | (6.9) | 43.6 | (7.7) |
| Toscana | 36.5 | (6.1) | 39.6 | (6.3) | 23.9 | (7.0) | 26.2 | (6.7) | 22.9 | (5.5) | 50.9 | (7.9) | 19.1 | (6.1) | 29.9 | (8.0) | 51.0 | (8.2) |
| Trento | 38.1 | (4.3) | 34.5 | (4.3) | 27.4 | (4.6) | 31.7 | (3.8) | 28.1 | (4.7) | 40.2 | (4.1) | 12.8 | (2.9) | 31.2 | (4.1) | 56.0 | (4.9) |
| Umbria | 31.7 | (5.7) | 40.4 | (6.1) | 27.9 | (6.4) | 11.1 | (4.2) | 32.1 | (5.6) | 56.8 | (5.2) | 9.0 | (2.9) | 41.6 | (5.4) | 49.3 | (5.3) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 56.0 | (1.1) | 35.2 | (1.0) | 8.7 | (0.6) | 51.1 | (0.9) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 36.9 | (0.9) | 22.7 | (0.8) | 53.4 | (0.8) | 24.0 | (0.9) |
| Veneto | 45.1 | (7.4) | 42.9 | (7.5) | 12.0 | (4.5) | 13.1 | (4.8) | 17.7 | (6.2) | 69.2 | (6.4) | 12.5 | (5.4) | 31.1 | (7.5) | 56.4 | (8.4) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 55.8 | (5.3) | 27.3 | (6.8) | 17.0 | (4.9) | 14.0 | (5.2) | 19.9 | (6.7) | 66.1 | (6.8) | 30.9 | (5.7) | 58.0 | (6.5) | 11.1 | (4.7) |
| Baja California | 43.9 | (8.4) | 29.1 | (9.1) | 27.0 | (4.8) | 22.7 | (12.2) | 30.7 | (14.1) | 46.6 | (7.0) | 40.7 | (11.0) | 53.9 | (11.3) | 5.5 | (2.8) |
| Baja California Sur | 47.8 | (5.7) | 27.2 | (7.9) | 24.9 | (7.9) | 35.9 | (8.8) | 13.7 | (4.9) | 50.3 | (7.7) | 57.2 | (9.3) | 30.5 | (7.8) | 12.3 | (5.0) |
| Campeche | 69.9 | (7.9) | 28.1 | (7.6) | 2.0 | (2.0) | 41.3 | (7.0) | 15.7 | (7.6) | 43.0 | (9.0) | 66.1 | (8.1) | 13.8 | (7.7) | 20.1 | (4.9) |
| Chiapas | 81.4 | (8.0) | 14.2 | (7.6) | 4.4 | (3.1) | 29.9 | (7.2) | 33.4 | (6.0) | 36.7 | (8.9) | 65.2 | (8.8) | 18.0 | (6.6) | 16.8 | (6.4) |
| Chihuahua | 49.2 | (10.9) | 45.8 | (11.5) | 5.0 | (3.6) | 25.3 | (8.0) | 34.3 | (9.6) | 40.4 | (6.5) | 51.3 | (11.5) | 36.3 | (9.3) | 12.4 | (7.0) |
| Coahuila | 75.7 | (8.5) | 16.0 | (6.7) | 8.3 | (6.0) | 20.0 | (6.2) | 19.4 | (7.5) | 60.5 | (9.3) | 52.6 | (9.5) | 25.9 | (8.3) | 21.5 | (7.6) |
| Colima | 63.3 | (5.9) | 21.9 | (6.1) | 14.8 | (5.6) | 19.8 | (4.9) | 23.0 | (6.3) | 57.2 | (6.2) | 80.5 | (5.3) | 16.6 | (5.2) | 2.8 | (2.0) |
| Distrito Federal | 59.3 | (9.0) | 32.4 | (10.1) | 8.3 | (6.9) | 37.8 | (8.4) | 24.0 | (8.0) | 38.2 | (8.1) | 69.0 | (8.7) | 22.3 | (6.8) | 8.7 | (5.4) |
| Durango | 66.5 | (9.7) | 14.6 | (3.3) | 18.9 | (10.7) | 17.4 | (6.5) | 23.8 | (8.2) | 58.9 | (7.9) | 53.9 | (9.2) | 32.8 | (7.8) | 13.3 | (6.3) |
| Guanajuato | 70.1 | (6.8) | 28.0 | (7.0) | 1.9 | (1.8) | 36.8 | (6.5) | 7.6 | (2.6) | 55.7 | (6.7) | 61.4 | (9.0) | 24.3 | (7.7) | 14.3 | (5.8) |
| Guerrero | 60.7 | (9.8) | 31.5 | (8.5) | 7.8 | (5.7) | 30.5 | (8.8) | 24.8 | (7.8) | 44.8 | (7.4) | 56.9 | (8.7) | 28.7 | (9.0) | 14.4 | (5.0) |
| Hidalgo | 80.4 | (5.5) | 13.9 | (4.8) | 5.7 | (2.8) | 26.4 | (6.4) | 15.3 | (5.2) | 58.3 | (7.1) | 66.6 | (8.5) | 26.1 | (7.6) | 7.3 | (4.0) |
| Jalisco | 54.9 | (7.7) | 37.3 | (8.1) | 7.8 | (3.8) | 41.4 | (7.6) | 8.6 | (4.3) | 50.0 | (6.5) | 77.1 | (6.1) | 14.0 | (2.7) | 8.9 | (5.0) |
| Mexico | 72.8 | (7.8) | 22.4 | (7.0) | 4.8 | (3.7) | 31.3 | (8.0) | 22.7 | (6.4) | 46.1 | (8.2) | 79.6 | (5.0) | 16.6 | (6.0) | 3.8 | (2.8) |
| Morelos | 63.5 | (5.0) | 19.7 | (4.9) | 16.8 | (5.4) | 22.8 | (7.2) | 20.0 | (7.0) | 57.1 | (8.1) | 50.6 | (9.4) | 21.7 | (6.9) | 27.7 | (8.4) |
| Nayarit | 58.2 | (5.8) | 24.1 | (5.3) | 17.6 | (6.0) | 32.3 | (4.5) | 14.1 | (3.6) | 53.6 | (5.8) | 55.2 | (6.6) | 36.9 | (6.9) | 7.8 | (3.3) |
| Nuevo León | 63.5 | (9.0) | 23.1 | (8.3) | 13.4 | (5.2) | 36.5 | (9.7) | 8.2 | (4.0) | 55.2 | (9.5) | 62.1 | (10.2) | 27.7 | (7.7) | 10.2 | (6.6) |
| Puebla | 74.5 | (7.7) | 22.4 | (7.2) | 3.1 | (3.0) | 33.4 | (6.1) | 26.9 | (6.5) | 39.7 | (4.2) | 59.6 | (7.8) | 23.3 | (6.9) | 17.1 | (4.6) |
| Querétaro | 40.2 | (10.8) | 31.1 | (10.3) | 28.8 | (6.6) | 26.6 | (8.7) | 13.7 | (3.2) | 59.7 | (10.0) | 70.3 | (8.3) | 19.2 | (7.5) | 10.5 | (3.1) |
| Quintana Roo | 55.7 | (8.2) | 24.9 | (8.8) | 19.4 | (7.5) | 24.3 | (4.0) | 27.8 | (4.6) | 47.9 | (7.0) | 40.6 | (7.6) | 46.5 | (7.0) | 13.0 | (4.7) |
| San Luis Potosí | 74.4 | (5.6) | 10.2 | (5.4) | 15.5 | (2.9) | 39.2 | (9.9) | 13.5 | (5.5) | 47.3 | (11.0) | 60.3 | (8.4) | 33.8 | (8.2) | 5.8 | (2.0) |
| Sinaloa | 64.2 | (9.0) | 22.8 | (7.4) | 13.0 | (5.3) | 24.6 | (7.4) | 21.7 | (7.1) | 53.7 | (8.1) | 42.6 | (9.4) | 37.7 | (6.8) | 19.7 | (6.8) |
| Tabasco | 51.3 | (9.9) | 42.5 | (9.2) | 6.2 | (3.7) | 28.9 | (8.9) | 25.3 | (8.6) | 45.8 | (8.3) | 64.2 | (9.1) | 22.8 | (8.5) | 13.0 | (5.7) |
| Tamaulipas | 67.2 | (11.8) | 21.5 | (10.1) | 11.3 | (7.3) | 13.7 | (5.7) | 26.1 | (6.5) | 60.2 | (7.8) | 43.0 | (11.2) | 37.1 | (11.1) | 19.9 | (7.9) |
| Tlaxcala | 63.2 | (6.0) | 31.1 | (6.2) | 5.7 | (2.4) | 34.0 | (6.3) | 12.0 | (5.0) | 54.1 | (7.5) | 67.4 | (6.1) | 24.3 | (5.4) | 8.3 | (3.9) |
| Veracruz | 70.1 | (6.7) | 21.9 | (4.3) | 8.0 | (5.5) | 49.5 | (9.2) | 21.5 | (8.0) | 29.0 | (5.4) | 74.7 | (6.7) | 15.0 | (6.4) | 10.3 | (3.2) |
| Yucatán | 64.8 | (9.7) | 15.5 | (5.7) | 19.8 | (8.8) | 23.3 | (7.1) | 26.8 | (9.5) | 49.9 | (10.2) | 87.0 | (4.8) | 9.1 | (2.8) | 3.9 | (3.9) |
| Zacatecas | 80.6 | (5.0) | 10.7 | (4.4) | 8.7 | (3.2) | 28.9 | (7.8) | 21.4 | (6.2) | 49.7 | (7.2) | 64.5 | (6.6) | 20.5 | (5.0) | 14.9 | (5.1) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.7 for national data
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Table B2．IV． 2 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following factors are＂never＂，＂sometimes＂or＂always＂ considered for admission to school： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Residence in a particular area |  |  |  |  |  | Students＇records of academic performance |  |  |  |  |  | Recommendations of feeder schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { O } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Alentejo | 16.4 | （9．0） | 44.1 | （12．3） | 39.6 | （10．7） | 56.5 | （13．1） | 22.8 | （10．6） | 20.8 | （7．7） | 83.1 | （6．6） | 10.7 | （5．6） | 6.2 | （4．5） |
|  | Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Andalusia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 19.5 | （5．7） | 12.3 | （4．1） | 68.1 | （6．5） | 94.1 | （3．4） | 5.9 | （3．4） | 0.0 | c | 84.8 | （4．6） | 7.4 | （3．7） | 7.8 | （3．9） |
|  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 36.3 | （7．6） | 19.6 | （5．8） | 44.2 | （7．8） | 95.5 | （3．1） | 4.5 | （3．1） | 0.0 | c | 93.4 | （3．8） | 4.5 | （3．1） | 2.1 | （2．1） |
|  | Asturias＊ | 16.3 | （5．3） | 26.7 | （5．6） | 57.0 | （6．3） | 91.1 | （4．4） | 8.9 | （4．4） | 0.0 | c | 91.9 | （2．5） | 8.1 | （2．5） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Balearic Islands＊ | 20.3 | （5．3） | 18.3 | （5．3） | 61.4 | （6．5） | 92.3 | （3．9） | 4.4 | （3．1） | 3.3 | （2．4） | 92.3 | （3．6） | 5.9 | （3．1） | 1.9 | （1．9） |
|  | Basque Country＊ | 23.8 | （3．2） | 22.2 | （3．0） | 54.0 | （3．7） | 82.4 | （3．0） | 14.0 | （2．7） | 3.7 | （1．5） | 66.0 | （4．0） | 22.3 | （3．5） | 11.7 | （2．3） |
|  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 19.2 | （4．7） | 22.3 | （5．2） | 58.6 | （5．5） | 95.8 | （3．0） | 1.9 | （2．0） | 2.3 | （2．2） | 93.9 | （3．6） | 3.9 | （2．8） | 2.3 | （2．2） |
|  | Castile and Leon＊ | 22.8 | （5．8） | 25.4 | （6．6） | 51.8 | （6．8） | 93.1 | （3．7） | 6.0 | （3．5） | 1.0 | （1．0） | 90.0 | （4．1） | 10.0 | （4．1） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 20.6 | （6．5） | 8.1 | （4．1） | 71.3 | （7．2） | 93.3 | （4．0） | 6.7 | （4．0） | 0.0 | c | 93.0 | （2．3） | 7.0 | （2．3） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Extremadura＊ | 35.8 | （7．4） | 12.3 | （4．9） | 51.9 | （7．7） | 93.7 | （3．6） | 4.3 | （3．0） | 2.0 | （2．0） | 94.0 | （3．5） | 3.9 | （2．8） | 2.1 | （2．1） |
|  | Galicia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 24.9 | （5．5） | 8.9 | （4．1） | 66.2 | （5．8） | 96.8 | （2．3） | 0.0 | c | 3.2 | （2．3） | 94.5 | （3．3） | 5.5 | （3．3） | 0.0 | c |
|  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 10.9 | （0．3） | 29.2 | （0．5） | 59.9 | （0．6） | 76.9 | （0．4） | 22.2 | （0．4） | 0.9 | （0．1） | 89.5 | （0．3） | 9.6 | （0．3） | 0.9 | （0．1） |
|  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 17.9 | （6．1） | 18.7 | （5．9） | 63.5 | （5．8） | 77.1 | （6．7） | 21.1 | （6．4） | 1.8 | （1．8） | 87.4 | （5．1） | 10.7 | （4．8） | 1.9 | （1．9） |
|  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 14.7 | （4．8） | 24.3 | （5．7） | 61.0 | （5．7） | 92.5 | （3．8） | 7.5 | （3．8） | 0.0 | c | 85.4 | （4．6） | 12.7 | （4．2） | 1.9 | （1．9） |
|  | Navarre＊ | 31.1 | （5．0） | 34.8 | （5．6） | 34.2 | （6．5） | 85.4 | （3．3） | 14.6 | （3．3） | 0.0 | c | 87.1 | （4．5） | 9.3 | （3．6） | 3.7 | （2．6） |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | England | 20.4 | （2．7） | 31.7 | （4．2） | 47.9 | （3．8） | 68.4 | （3．2） | 9.1 | （2．8） | 22.5 | （2．6） | 57.8 | （4．0） | 22.6 | （4．1） | 19.6 | （2．9） |
|  | Northern Ireland | 29.4 | （5．7） | 37.1 | （4．9） | 33.5 | （5．3） | 38.9 | （4．0） | 8.7 | （2．2） | 52.3 | （3．5） | 43.5 | （5．1） | 26.9 | （5．2） | 29.6 | （4．5） |
|  | Scotland ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 22.0 | （3．6） | 17.2 | （4．0） | 60.8 | （4．7） | 76.4 | （3．8） | 4.3 | （2．0） | 19.4 | （3．9） | 59.7 | （5．0） | 17.1 | （3．9） | 23.1 | （4．1） |
|  | Wales | 27.5 | （3．6） | 26.4 | （3．5） | 46.1 | （3．6） | 74.7 | （3．8） | 7.1 | （2．2） | 18.2 | （3．1） | 58.3 | （4．0） | 19.4 | （3．4） | 22.4 | （3．5） |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Connecticut ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 28.0 | （7．2） | 5.7 | （3．3） | 66.3 | （7．8） | 48.7 | （6．2） | 0.0 | c | 51.3 | （6．2） | 48.4 | （6．6） | 19.1 | （6．2） | 32.4 | （7．0） |
|  | Florida ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 8.0 | （3．3） | 8.8 | （4．1） | 83.2 | （5．3） | 36.7 | （8．0） | 34.7 | （7．6） | 28.6 | （7．1） | 48.0 | （7．3） | 34.7 | （6．7） | 17.3 | （5．9） |
|  | Massachusetts＊ | 30.9 | （6．1） | 8.2 | （4．2） | 61.0 | （7．4） | 55.2 | （8．0） | 8.9 | （4．1） | 36.0 | （7．5） | 52.4 | （8．6） | 19.3 | （5．4） | 28.3 | （7．7） |
| $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\stackrel{3}{2}}$ | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 57.6 | （8．3） | 19.4 | （7．3） | 23.0 | （7．1） | 33.3 | （6．5） | 35.0 | （7．6） | 31.8 | （7．6） | 42.0 | （7．6） | 39.5 | （7．5） | 18.5 | （6．2） |
|  | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acre | 34.6 | （13．3） | 21.0 | （9．0） | 44.4 | （13．6） | 67.2 | （11．0） | 6.4 | （4．7） | 26.4 | （11．1） | 76.7 | （8．2） | 13.2 | （5．1） | 10.0 | （6．2） |
|  | Alagoas | 59.1 | （9．8） | 20.3 | （7．2） | 20.5 | （9．8） | 46.6 | （12．5） | 9.5 | （6．9） | 43.9 | （13．1） | 73.0 | （10．8） | 15.1 | （7．9） | 11.9 | （7．8） |
|  | Amapá | 20.4 | （8．0） | 36.1 | （6．8） | 43.5 | （10．0） | 49.0 | （9．3） | 25.5 | （10．1） | 25.5 | （11．2） | 43.9 | （11．0） | 41.8 | （9．7） | 14.3 | （8．1） |
|  | Amazonas | 19.9 | （9．4） | 31.6 | （9．9） | 48.5 | （7．8） | 67.5 | （9．5） | 20.2 | （8．8） | 12.2 | （2．6） | 70.6 | （9．5） | 23.5 | （9．9） | 5.9 | （4．1） |
|  | Bahia | 47.6 | （9．8） | 14.4 | （9．0） | 38.0 | （8．9） | 73.0 | （13．2） | 14.9 | （10．6） | 12.2 | （7．8） | 48.1 | （11．3） | 25.2 | （11．1） | 26.7 | （13．3） |
|  | Ceará | 34.4 | （10．3） | 29.4 | （10．2） | 36.2 | （10．3） | 51.1 | （7．0） | 20.0 | （7．9） | 28.9 | （7．7） | 77.2 | （8．5） | 15.7 | （7．9） | 7.1 | （2．0） |
|  | Espírito Santo | 26.3 | （14．9） | 31.0 | （15．3） | 42.6 | （8．8） | 92.4 | （6．9） | 7.6 | （6．9） | 0.0 | c | 74.8 | （6．9） | 19.7 | （8．9） | 5.6 | （3．9） |
|  | Federal District | 28.1 | （6．8） | 40.7 | （9．8） | 31.2 | （11．0） | 70.4 | （10．1） | 17.5 | （7．6） | 12.1 | （6．8） | 90.5 | （5．8） | 2.1 | （2．1） | 7.4 | （5．2） |
|  | Goiás | 36.8 | （8．3） | 26.0 | （9．7） | 37.3 | （9．6） | 71.6 | （7．8） | 1.4 | （1．4） | 27.0 | （7．5） | 65.8 | （9．1） | 29.5 | （10．0） | 4.7 | （4．6） |
|  | Maranhão | 32.0 | （12．3） | 34.4 | （9．5） | 33.6 | （13．7） | 50.3 | （10．8） | 14.2 | （8．5） | 35.5 | （11．4） | 57.6 | （14．4） | 38.5 | （14．3） | 3.8 | （4．0） |
|  | Mato Grosso | 48.3 | （10．7） | 39.9 | （10．0） | 11.8 | （3．3） | 55.2 | （11．7） | 23.8 | （10．5） | 21.0 | （8．2） | 61.4 | （8．4） | 26.0 | （8．7） | 12.6 | （7．5） |
|  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 23.4 | （8．8） | 40.6 | （10．4） | 36.0 | （7．5） | 79.2 | （6．7） | 6.6 | （5．1） | 14.2 | （7．1） | 67.8 | （9．2） | 25.4 | （9．6） | 6.9 | （4．9） |
|  | Minas Gerais | 48.2 | （9．9） | 16.0 | （6．8） | 35.9 | （9．6） | 70.9 | （7．8） | 9.5 | （5．0） | 19.5 | （6．5） | 73.4 | （8．1） | 19.3 | （7．9） | 7.3 | （4．9） |
|  | Pará | 32.5 | （6．0） | 40.9 | （11．2） | 26.5 | （11．5） | 49.7 | （9．3） | 36.9 | （6．9） | 13.4 | （6．9） | 69.7 | （8．1） | 21.3 | （5．1） | 9.0 | （6．4） |
|  | Paraíba | 46.6 | （11．3） | 31.1 | （9．6） | 22.3 | （5．8） | 71.6 | （6．7） | 13.7 | （7．1） | 14.7 | （7．1） | 65.2 | （12．9） | 23.4 | （10．7） | 11.4 | （5．9） |
|  | Paraná | 13.6 | （8．8） | 36.5 | （11．0） | 49.9 | （8．7） | 82.3 | （9．5） | 11.7 | （8．5） | 6.0 | （4．4） | 69.7 | （10．8） | 21.8 | （8．0） | 8.5 | （8．3） |
|  | Pernambuco | 33.5 | （11．4） | 39.9 | （12．4） | 26.6 | （10．2） | 50.8 | （11．3） | 5.3 | （5．2） | 44.0 | （12．3） | 69.4 | （9．6） | 28.5 | （9．2） | 2.2 | （2．2） |
|  | Piauí | 30.9 | （9．4） | 50.2 | （12．0） | 19.0 | （6．0） | 19.6 | （7．7） | 29.9 | （9．9） | 50.5 | （10．0） | 36.7 | （13．1） | 49.7 | （13．6） | 13.6 | （5．1） |
|  | Rio de Janeiro | 39.4 | （9．3） | 36.0 | （8．7） | 24.6 | （9．1） | 69.5 | （9．2） | 10.9 | （4．2） | 19.6 | （9．2） | 73.0 | （9．4） | 27.0 | （9．4） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Rio Grande do Norte | 36.8 | （9．7） | 27.2 | （8．1） | 36.0 | （12．5） | 62.0 | （10．5） | 23.4 | （8．4） | 14.6 | （8．1） | 67.5 | （10．8） | 29.1 | （10．2） | 3.4 | （3．5） |
|  | Rio Grande do Sul | 37.5 | （10．8） | 31.3 | （11．1） | 31.3 | （10．1） | 75.1 | （8．7） | 4.8 | （3．5） | 20.1 | （8．1） | 92.9 | （4．9） | 3.9 | （3．9） | 3.2 | （3．1） |
|  | Rondônia | 21.5 | （7．0） | 49.0 | （11．9） | 29.5 | （10．2） | 70.6 | （9．1） | 8.3 | （5．8） | 21.1 | （7．9） | 69.0 | （6．9） | 18.5 | （5．4） | 12.6 | （4．4） |
|  | Roraima | 17.3 | （8．4） | 42.6 | （8．5） | 40.1 | （8．2） | 61.7 | （9．5） | 20.9 | （6．0） | 17.4 | （9．8） | 70.8 | （5．5） | 16.1 | （5．4） | 13.1 | （4．5） |
|  | Santa Catarina | 36.9 | （8．0） | 34.8 | （8．4） | 28.4 | （7．1） | 91.4 | （5．2） | 8.6 | （5．2） | 0.0 | c | 87.1 | （6．2） | 10.8 | （5．9） | 2.0 | （2．1） |
|  | São Paulo | 23.6 | （4．1） | 21.1 | （5．8） | 55.2 | （5．3） | 78.8 | （5．4） | 12.1 | （4．3） | 9.2 | （3．4） | 68.9 | （6．5） | 25.4 | （5．7） | 5.7 | （3．3） |
|  | Sergipe | 34.1 | （11．0） | 40.8 | （12．7） | 25.0 | （12．4） | 45.5 | （10．0） | 20.5 | （12．5） | 33.9 | （12．9） | 71.3 | （9．1） | 20.2 | （11．0） | 8.5 | （10．5） |
|  | Tocantins | 44.1 | （8．6） | 44.1 | （9．0） | 11.8 | （6．8） | 33.3 | （8．3） | 18.1 | （6．4） | 48.7 | （8．5） | 65.3 | （7．2） | 24.3 | （6．4） | 10.5 | （5．6） |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bogota | 47.2 | （7．0） | 21.2 | （5．8） | 31.7 | （4．8） | 55.0 | （5．9） | 20.9 | （5．5） | 24.1 | （5．0） | 76.9 | （3．9） | 20.6 | （4．9） | 2.5 | （2．6） |
|  | Cali | 44.8 | （6．0） | 30.4 | （7．0） | 24.9 | （6．2） | 26.4 | （5．8） | 30.7 | （6．9） | 42.9 | （7．0） | 37.3 | （6．2） | 41.7 | （7．5） | 21.0 | （5．4） |
|  | Manizales | 48.8 | （8．2） | 31.7 | （6．8） | 19.6 | （5．0） | 24.3 | （6．5） | 28.4 | （7．4） | 47.3 | （8．4） | 43.3 | （8．9） | 42.0 | （8．3） | 14.7 | （5．3） |
|  | Medellin | 52.5 | （8．2） | 30.2 | （7．5） | 17.3 | （5．6） | 32.1 | （6．9） | 36.0 | （8．2） | 32.0 | （6．7） | 49.0 | （7．5） | 34.6 | （7．4） | 16.3 | （4．8） |
|  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perm Territory region ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 23.8 | （5．6） | 18.0 | （5．0） | 58.2 | （7．0） | 43.4 | （5．8） | 37.4 | （6．5） | 19.2 | （5．6） | 43.0 | （5．7） | 44.8 | （6．6） | 12.2 | （4．6） |
|  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abu Dhabi＊ | 33.0 | （3．5） | 15.9 | （2．9） | 51.2 | （3．1） | 14.0 | （2．9） | 28.4 | （3．6） | 57.6 | （3．4） | 26.2 | （3．7） | 40.5 | （3．7） | 33.3 | （3．8） |
|  | Ajman | 16.2 | （4．7） | 28.7 | （8．5） | 55.2 | （7．4） | 0.0 | c | 36.9 | （6．6） | 63.1 | （6．6） | 17.3 | （8．5） | 42.1 | （7．3） | 40.6 | （5．7） |
|  | Dubai ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 43.8 | （0．3） | 35.0 | （0．3） | 21.2 | （0．2） | 2.5 | （0．0） | 12.2 | （0．1） | 85.3 | （0．1） | 13.2 | （0．2） | 48.5 | （0．2） | 38.3 | （0．2） |
|  | Fujairah | 44.0 | （2．1） | 12.9 | （3．3） | 43.1 | （4．2） | 15.2 | （4．7） | 25.0 | （5．8） | 59.8 | （6．1） | 16.6 | （5．8） | 39.1 | （6．3） | 44.3 | （3．8） |
|  | Ras Al Khaimah | 24.8 | （7．4） | 6.0 | （3．7） | 69.2 | （8．4） | 22.2 | （7．0） | 38.4 | （8．5） | 39.4 | （8．5） | 34.3 | （10．4） | 43.1 | （9．5） | 22.6 | （8．5） |
|  | Sharjah | 37.4 | （10．6） | 30.9 | （7．7） | 31.7 | （8．9） | 4.1 | （5．7） | 26.0 | （6．1） | 69.9 | （7．6） | 21.1 | （9．2） | 50.7 | （8．6） | 28.2 | （8．8） |
|  | Umm Al Quwain | 7.7 | （0．5） | 24.9 | （0．4） | 67.3 | （0．5） | 43.3 | （0．2） | 10.7 | （0．3） | 46.0 | （0．3） | 22.9 | （0．3） | 69.7 | （0．3） | 7.4 | （0．1） |

－PISA adjudicated region．
Note：See Table IV．2．7 for national data．
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School admissions policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 2 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whos <br> Parents' endorsement of the instructional or religious philosophy of the school |  |  |  |  |  | princ | pal rep nsidere | rted th for ad | at the mission | llowing | factor ol: | are "n | ever", | someti | mes" or | "alway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Whether the student requires or is interested in a special programme |  |  |  |  |  | Preference given to family members of current or former students |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 33.1 | (1.0) | 37.6 | (1.0) | 29.3 | (1.0) | 17.5 | (0.7) | 66.9 | (0.8) | 15.6 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (0.3) | . 2 | (0.9) | 65.2 | (0.9) |
| O New South Wales | 49.9 | (3.0) | 17.3 | (2.8) | 32.9 | (2.4) | 26.2 | (3.2) | 47.1 | (3.1) | 26.6 | (3.0) | 26.6 | (3.4) | 39.2 | (4.0) | 34.2 | (4.0) |
| Northern territory | 42.7 | (4.9) | 24.6 | (2.5) | 32.7 | (3.2) | 24.0 | (5.9) | 49.1 | (4.4) | 26.9 | (2.6) | 63.2 | (3.7) | 13.4 | (8.5) | 23.4 | (9.7) |
| Queensland | 44.7 | (3.7) | 25.6 | (3.7) | 29.7 | (3.6) | 15.7 | (3.1) | 57.7 | (4.4) | 26.5 | (4.1) | 39.4 | (2.7) | 18.1 | (3.3) | 42.5 | (3.4) |
| South Australia | 44.6 | (3.6) | 26.8 | (4.4) | 28.7 | (4.5) | 14.8 | (2.9) | 59.2 | (5.2) | 26.0 | (4.7) | 22.6 | (2.9) | 29.3 | (4.9) | 48.1 | (4.5) |
| Tasmania | 51.2 | (1.2) | 18.2 | (1.0) | 30.5 | (1.1) | 29.8 | (1.4) | 44.3 | (1.7) | 25.8 | (1.0) | 27.6 | (1.7) | 30.3 | (1.1) | 42.1 | (1.6) |
| Victoria | 44.0 | (3.6) | 24.8 | (3.6) | 31.2 | (2.9) | 21.4 | (3.6) | 63.3 | (3.9) | 15.3 | (3.3) | 20.3 | (3.3) | 31.0 | (4.2) | 48.7 | (3.9) |
| Western Australia | 47.5 | (5.3) | 23.3 | (4.4) | 29.2 | (4.7) | 13.9 | (3.6) | 60.9 | (4.5) | 25.2 | (3.6) | 22.2 | (3.8) | 35.9 | (5.1) | 41.9 | (4.6) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 59.5 | (4.1) | 15.9 | (2.9) | 24.6 | (3.8) | 41.3 | (4.1) | 54.9 | (4.2) | 3.8 | (1.6) | 54.9 | (3.9) | 20.7 | (3.5) | 24.4 | (3.4) |
| French community | 18.6 | (4.1) | 17.5 | (3.8) | 63.8 | (4.8) | 30.1 | (4.7) | 52.7 | (5.2) | 17.2 | (3.7) | 37.4 | (4.5) | 32.1 | (4.9) | 30.5 | (4.8) |
| German-speaking community | 29.2 | (0.3) | 46.1 | (0.3) | 24.7 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 49.6 | (0.3) | 50.4 | (0.3) | 89.8 | (0.0) | 10.2 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 47.5 | (5.2) | 29.3 | (4.4) | 23.2 | (4.7) | 15.9 | (4.2) | 60.5 | (5.0) | 23.6 | (4.5) | 43.4 | (4.5) | 36.9 | (4.3) | 19.7 | (4.1) |
| British Columbia | 69.4 | (5.1) | 22.4 | (5.2) | 8.1 | (2.6) | 20.2 | (5.0) | 65.9 | (5.3) | 13.9 | (4.2) | 37.0 | (5.0) | 36.0 | (5.8) | 27.0 | (4.9) |
| Manitoba | 78.4 | (2.4) | 12.2 | (2.3) | 9.4 | (0.9) | 21.8 | (2.9) | 55.2 | (3.4) | 23.0 | (2.2) | 56.4 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (2.8) | 6.7 | (0.9) |
| New Brunswick | 91.7 | (1.2) | 8.2 | (1.2) | 0.1 | (0.1) | 47.8 | (2.4) | 40.8 | (2.2) | 11.4 | (3.2) | 88.8 | (1.6) | 11.2 | (1.6) | 0.1 | (0.1) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 87.7 | (1.9) | 6.0 | (1.2) | 6.3 | (1.4) | 50.6 | (4.3) | 34.1 | (4.1) | 15.3 | (2.2) | 73.8 | (1.4) | 15.5 | (1.0) | 10.7 | (1.2) |
| Nova Scotia | 72.1 | (10.7) | 25.5 | (11.0) | 2.4 | (0.4) | 24.0 | (5.9) | 45.9 | (8.1) | 30.2 | (10.1) | 83.5 | (3.5) | 15.9 | (3.4) | 0.6 | (0.5) |
| Ontario | 65.1 | (4.8) | 21.2 | (4.2) | 13.7 | (3.6) | 17.5 | (3.9) | 50.4 | (5.5) | 32.1 | (5.1) | 60.1 | (5.2) | 28.5 | (4.8) | 11.4 | (3.3) |
| Prince Edward Island | 73.8 | (0.3) | 24.7 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.2) | 16.9 | (0.4) | 59.2 | (0.5) | 24.0 | (0.4) | 82.6 | (0.3) | 17.4 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c |
| Quebec | 73.9 | (3.3) | 16.7 | (3.2) | 9.4 | (2.1) | 18.4 | (3.1) | 57.9 | (4.4) | 23.7 | (3.9) | 51.4 | (3.8) | 30.7 | (4.0) | 17.9 | (3.3) |
| Saskatchewan | 56.7 | (2.4) | 23.9 | (2.3) | 19.4 | (1.4) | 36.2 | (3.8) | 44.1 | (2.7) | 19.7 | (2.4) | 88.4 | (1.6) | 8.7 | (1.5) | 3.0 | (1.7) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 28.1 | (6.0) | 25.8 | (6.1) | 46.1 | (6.0) | 7.5 | (3.8) | 38.5 | (5.6) | 54.0 | (6.3) | 25.2 | (5.3) | 34.7 | (6.0) | 40.1 | (6.1) |
| Basilicata | 33.9 | (5.8) | 22.6 | (3.2) | 43.5 | (5.6) | 16.7 | (4.9) | 45.8 | (4.9) | 37.4 | (4.7) | 20.0 | (5.9) | 63.4 | (7.4) | 16.6 | (5.0) |
| Bolzano | 77.0 | (0.7) | 19.0 | (0.7) | 4.1 | (0.2) | 37.1 | (1.2) | 26.4 | (0.7) | 36.5 | (0.8) | 65.7 | (0.9) | 31.9 | (0.8) | 2.5 | (0.2) |
| Calabria | 28.3 | (6.9) | 26.3 | (8.0) | 45.4 | (7.5) | 16.3 | (5.5) | 20.5 | (6.7) | 63.1 | (7.8) | 17.2 | (6.0) | 46.9 | (7.8) | 35.9 | (7.9) |
| Campania | 32.5 | (6.5) | 18.2 | (8.5) | 49.4 | (8.7) | 28.3 | (7.9) | 30.2 | (9.1) | 41.4 | (7.5) | 20.3 | (6.1) | 41.6 | (7.9) | 38.0 | (7.2) |
| Emilia Romagna | 50.9 | (8.1) | 17.5 | (6.5) | 31.6 | (7.2) | 16.6 | (6.3) | 29.8 | (6.4) | 53.6 | (8.3) | 44.5 | (7.5) | 24.8 | (6.7) | 30.7 | (6.5) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 39.8 | (4.6) | 23.5 | (6.9) | 36.8 | (7.5) | 2.2 | (2.2) | 37.3 | (6.0) | 60.5 | (5.7) | 26.1 | (4.2) | 60.1 | (5.9) | 13.8 | (4.5) |
| Lazio | 34.8 | (7.5) | 19.5 | (6.0) | 45.7 | (8.9) | 18.0 | (5.9) | 56.0 | (8.2) | 26.0 | (7.0) | 25.2 | (7.5) | 37.7 | (7.1) | 37.1 | (8.0) |
| Liguria | 42.9 | (6.5) | 18.3 | (5.5) | 38.9 | (7.7) | 13.3 | (3.8) | 34.5 | (7.6) | 52.2 | (7.8) | 33.7 | (6.9) | 49.1 | (6.7) | 17.2 | (5.1) |
| Lombardia | 38.8 | (6.8) | 23.4 | (5.6) | 37.8 | (6.6) | 13.7 | (5.4) | 35.6 | (7.8) | 50.7 | (7.8) | 30.3 | (7.2) | 46.5 | (7.7) | 23.3 | (5.1) |
| Marche | 39.2 | (7.3) | 14.0 | (5.2) | 46.8 | (5.2) | 12.8 | (5.2) | 29.6 | (7.7) | 57.6 | (8.0) | 35.3 | (6.8) | 44.0 | (7.5) | 20.7 | (6.4) |
| Molise | 22.3 | (0.7) | 25.1 | (0.8) | 52.6 | (1.0) | 11.4 | (0.7) | 46.1 | (1.0) | 42.5 | (0.9) | 24.6 | (0.9) | 52.3 | (0.9) | 23.2 | (0.7) |
| Piemonte | 38.4 | (6.5) | 31.5 | (7.3) | 30.1 | (6.5) | 18.3 | (5.2) | 39.4 | (7.3) | 42.3 | (7.8) | 24.2 | (5.9) | 55.2 | (5.5) | 20.6 | (4.2) |
| Puglia | 31.7 | (6.5) | 33.7 | (7.0) | 34.6 | (6.7) | 18.0 | (4.5) | 50.9 | (7.0) | 31.1 | (6.0) | 22.6 | (5.4) | 50.9 | (7.3) | 26.5 | (6.0) |
| Sardegna | 42.7 | (7.3) | 21.7 | (6.7) | 35.6 | (6.7) | 24.5 | (4.6) | 31.9 | (7.0) | 43.6 | (7.7) | 30.8 | (5.2) | 35.1 | (6.7) | 34.1 | (6.9) |
| Sicilia | 27.2 | (6.8) | 23.0 | (6.2) | 49.8 | (6.0) | 15.3 | (4.7) | 49.3 | (6.9) | 35.4 | (5.4) | 25.7 | (6.0) | 51.4 | (7.7) | 22.9 | (5.4) |
| Toscana | 42.6 | (7.3) | 20.8 | (7.2) | 36.6 | (7.8) | 21.1 | (6.5) | 30.8 | (7.3) | 48.0 | (8.4) | 34.1 | (7.1) | 42.2 | (7.3) | 23.7 | (6.9) |
| Trento | 57.5 | (4.9) | 17.1 | (3.0) | 25.4 | (4.2) | 9.3 | (1.4) | 51.6 | (4.5) | 39.0 | (4.8) | 58.2 | (5.9) | 24.3 | (5.4) | 17.5 | (2.5) |
| Umbria | 25.7 | (4.5) | 28.2 | (4.2) | 46.1 | (5.1) | 5.0 | (2.3) | 58.7 | (6.5) | 36.3 | (6.1) | 30.0 | (5.9) | 48.5 | (4.5) | 21.5 | (3.9) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 90.7 | (0.6) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 8.4 | (0.6) | 43.2 | (1.0) | 39.9 | (0.8) | 17.0 | (0.8) | 76.7 | (0.8) | 21.6 | (0.7) | 1.7 | (0.3) |
| Veneto | 39.8 | (6.2) | 25.6 | (6.7) | 34.6 | (6.8) | 12.6 | (4.6) | 49.3 | (6.8) | 38.1 | (6.1) | 22.4 | (6.6) | 65.4 | (7.5) | 12.2 | (4.7) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 56.5 | (6.9) | 9.3 | (5.1) | 34.3 | (6.7) | 33.4 | (8.1) | 51.3 | (7.9) | 15.3 | (3.7) | 52.9 | (7.1) | 30.1 | (6.9) | 17.1 | (4.3) |
| Baja California | 80.4 | (6.7) | 8.7 | (6.3) | 10.9 | (3.5) | 63.6 | (8.9) | 25.4 | (7.8) | 11.1 | (5.1) | 55.4 | (6.9) | 18.4 | (5.9) | 26.3 | (6.0) |
| Baja California Sur | 78.6 | (7.8) | 9.2 | (5.9) | 12.2 | (5.3) | 46.6 | (7.1) | 43.7 | (5.7) | 9.7 | (5.8) | 60.4 | (8.9) | 21.5 | (7.5) | 18.1 | (5.6) |
| Campeche | 86.1 | (5.3) | 9.3 | (4.9) | 4.7 | (1.9) | 67.9 | (8.6) | 26.3 | (8.5) | 5.8 | (1.8) | 80.0 | (9.4) | 20.0 | (9.4) | 0.0 | c |
| Chiapas | 71.3 | (7.1) | 9.0 | (4.7) | 19.8 | (6.7) | 51.4 | (8.6) | 42.8 | (7.8) | 5.8 | (4.3) | 83.9 | (5.5) | 15.6 | (5.4) | 0.5 | (0.5) |
| Chihuahua | 61.7 | (11.5) | 15.8 | (6.6) | 22.6 | (10.8) | 43.2 | (9.9) | 46.5 | (9.6) | 10.3 | (4.7) | 43.8 | (9.8) | 44.1 | (11.3) | 12.2 | (7.2) |
| Coahuila | 79.3 | (4.9) | 14.9 | (4.3) | 5.9 | (3.1) | 56.1 | (8.4) | 32.9 | (8.2) | 11.0 | (2.6) | 71.0 | (8.9) | 20.7 | (7.9) | 8.2 | (4.9) |
| Colima | 80.3 | (7.2) | 8.9 | (4.7) | 10.8 | (5.8) | 61.0 | (5.9) | 33.7 | (5.6) | 5.3 | (2.5) | 82.7 | (4.4) | 17.3 | (4.4) | 0.0 | c |
| Distrito Federal | 59.5 | (8.7) | 16.0 | (7.3) | 24.5 | (9.2) | 42.1 | (8.0) | 40.3 | (7.8) | 17.6 | (8.8) | 64.0 | (7.2) | 23.4 | (8.6) | 12.5 | (7.2) |
| Durango | 74.8 | (5.5) | 8.3 | (3.3) | 16.9 | (3.7) | 49.7 | (9.8) | 19.3 | (5.4) | 31.0 | (10.5) | 71.4 | (10.7) | 25.7 | (10.7) | 3.0 | (2.2) |
| Guanajuato | 69.5 | (6.6) | 21.2 | (5.4) | 9.4 | (4.0) | 48.5 | (8.5) | 37.1 | (7.8) | 14.3 | (5.3) | 71.9 | (8.8) | 26.8 | (8.7) | 1.4 | (1.3) |
| Guerrero | 72.9 | (4.9) | 15.8 | (4.5) | 11.3 | (5.4) | 44.6 | (6.4) | 47.9 | (6.6) | 7.5 | (4.1) | 76.6 | (6.1) | 17.0 | (7.0) | 6.5 | (4.5) |
| Hidalgo | 80.0 | (6.8) | 14.0 | (5.7) | 5.9 | (3.8) | 49.1 | (7.6) | 38.3 | (7.8) | 12.6 | (4.7) | 80.7 | (6.8) | 12.5 | (6.0) | 6.8 | (3.6) |
| Jalisco | 64.8 | (7.4) | 25.6 | (8.1) | 9.6 | (6.0) | 54.4 | (10.3) | 41.5 | (10.1) | 4.1 | (2.8) | 70.1 | (8.4) | 26.5 | (9.3) | 3.5 | (2.5) |
| Mexico | 66.8 | (7.4) | 18.5 | (4.6) | 14.7 | (6.0) | 60.7 | (9.1) | 26.9 | (8.7) | 12.4 | (5.5) | 77.8 | (6.3) | 12.2 | (5.5) | 10.0 | (4.6) |
| Morelos | 74.3 | (8.9) | 11.5 | (6.1) | 14.2 | (6.5) | 51.7 | (8.9) | 41.5 | (9.1) | 6.8 | (2.9) | 73.1 | (7.9) | 24.8 | (7.8) | 2.1 | (1.5) |
| Nayarit | 65.4 | (6.1) | 14.7 | (5.3) | 19.9 | (6.8) | 51.0 | (6.5) | 30.9 | (6.9) | 18.1 | (5.8) | 64.6 | (6.3) | 21.8 | (4.6) | 13.6 | (5.2) |
| Nuevo León | 64.4 | (8.8) | 16.4 | (4.5) | 19.2 | (7.5) | 44.9 | (9.5) | 43.2 | (9.2) | 11.9 | (6.1) | 65.2 | (7.5) | 13.2 | (6.4) | 21.6 | (9.3) |
| Puebla | 59.5 | (8.9) | 23.5 | (8.1) | 16.9 | (6.2) | 43.5 | (9.0) | 54.2 | (8.8) | 2.3 | (1.9) | 73.0 | (6.0) | 23.4 | (5.5) | 3.6 | (2.3) |
| Querétaro | 77.3 | (5.8) | 14.1 | (3.5) | 8.6 | (4.0) | 58.6 | (5.9) | 24.9 | (5.9) | 16.5 | (4.7) | 70.1 | (5.5) | 16.5 | (6.2) | 13.3 | (5.4) |
| Quintana Roo | 55.6 | (9.2) | 28.1 | (8.9) | 16.3 | (7.6) | 34.1 | (6.7) | 49.5 | (10.5) | 16.4 | (7.3) | 48.2 | (8.7) | 41.6 | (9.0) | 10.1 | (5.6) |
| San Luis Potosí | 67.5 | (10.5) | 9.4 | (4.8) | 23.0 | (9.8) | 59.5 | (10.0) | 33.9 | (10.1) | 6.6 | (2.4) | 76.1 | (9.8) | 10.6 | (8.4) | 13.3 | (6.5) |
| Sinaloa | 79.5 | (5.1) | 12.1 | (5.0) | 8.4 | (4.8) | 47.4 | (8.2) | 40.9 | (6.3) | 11.7 | (5.4) | 59.3 | (10.0) | 28.8 | (8.1) | 11.9 | (6.3) |
| Tabasco | 68.6 | (8.0) | 19.9 | (6.2) | 11.4 | (6.8) | 40.3 | (10.4) | 45.2 | (10.2) | 14.6 | (5.7) | 68.4 | (8.6) | 30.6 | (8.4) | 1.0 | (1.0) |
| Tamaulipas | 74.0 | (10.4) | 8.8 | (4.5) | 17.2 | (9.7) | 37.7 | (10.3) | 32.7 | (9.3) | 29.7 | (10.8) | 56.6 | (11.8) | 32.1 | (10.8) | 11.3 | (7.3) |
| Tlaxcala | 64.1 | (6.8) | 21.4 | (5.4) | 14.5 | (5.5) | 34.7 | (7.1) | 43.6 | (7.5) | 21.7 | (4.4) | 78.9 | (6.4) | 21.1 | (6.4) | 0.0 | c |
| Veracruz | 79.2 | (4.3) | 11.9 | (3.7) | 8.9 | (2.3) | 56.8 | (8.7) | 35.9 | (8.8) | 7.3 | (4.4) | 86.1 | (3.5) | 13.9 | (3.5) | 0.0 | c |
| Yucatán | 85.0 | (6.2) | 11.2 | (5.7) | 3.7 | (2.3) | 68.0 | (7.6) | 25.9 | (6.8) | 6.1 | (3.2) | 68.3 | (9.1) | 23.8 | (6.8) | 8.0 | (7.7) |
| Zacatecas | 73.9 | (6.3) | 9.2 | (4.6) | 16.9 | (7.9) | 58.3 | (7.1) | 26.3 | (5.5) | 15.3 | (4.9) | 92.1 | (3.4) | 7.9 | (3.4) | 0.0 | c |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.7 for national data

［Part 4／6］
School admissions policies，by region
Table B2．IV． 2 Results based on school principals＇reports

|  |  | Percentage of students in schools whos <br> Parents＇endorsement of the instructional or religious philosophy of the school |  |  |  |  |  | principal reported that the following factor considered for admission to school： <br> Whether the student requires or is interested in a special programme |  |  |  |  |  | Preference given to family members of current or former students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Never | Sometimes |  | Always |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { W } \end{aligned}$ | Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Alentejo | 60.8 | （9．3） | 9.0 | （2．7） | 30.2 | （9．7） | 3.2 | （2．6） | 47.6 | （11．5） | 49.2 | （11．1） | 28.6 | （10．7） | 48.8 | （13．5） | 22.6 | （9．7） |
|  | Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Andalusia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 93.7 | （3．6） | 4.4 | （3．1） | 1.8 | （1．9） | 66.0 | （6．8） | 20.7 | （6．4） | 13.3 | （4．2） | 42.2 | （7．8） | 21.7 | （6．0） | 36.1 | （6．4） |
|  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 89.9 | （4．6） | 6.7 | （3．8） | 3.4 | （2．5） | 65.0 | （6．9） | 33.7 | （6．9） | 1.2 | （1．2） | 61.3 | （6．7） | 27.4 | （6．1） | 11.3 | （3．3） |
|  | Asturias＊ | 85.3 | （4．3） | 3.7 | （2．6） | 11.0 | （3．4） | 57.3 | （6．5） | 32.4 | （5．4） | 10.2 | （4．2） | 31.3 | （5．4） | 39.8 | （5．0） | 28.9 | （4．3） |
|  | Balearic Islands＊ | 77.2 | （5．7） | 10.4 | （4．3） | 12.4 | （4．2） | 57.7 | （7．8） | 37.0 | （7．9） | 5.4 | （3．1） | 30.3 | （5．2） | 35.5 | （6．0） | 34.2 | （5．1） |
|  | Basque Country＊ | 61.9 | （3．7） | 16.3 | （2．6） | 21.8 | （3．3） | 54.4 | （3．7） | 30.0 | （3．4） | 15.7 | （3．0） | 30.5 | （3．0） | 29.4 | （3．0） | 40.1 | （3．7） |
|  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 88.7 | （4．0） | 5.7 | （2．9） | 5.6 | （3．3） | 51.5 | （6．3） | 36.4 | （6．2） | 12.2 | （4．3） | 46.9 | （5．7） | 34.1 | （5．9） | 19.0 | （5．4） |
|  | Castile and Leon＊ | 75.0 | （6．0） | 16.9 | （5．0） | 8.1 | （3．8） | 50.6 | （7．3） | 36.9 | （6．5） | 12.5 | （4．9） | 37.3 | （7．2） | 23.2 | （6．2） | 39.5 | （7．1） |
|  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 86.5 | （3．2） | 2.0 | （2．0） | 11.5 | （3．9） | 74.7 | （6．7） | 20.4 | （6．4） | 4.9 | （3．5） | 30.8 | （6．9） | 18.3 | （6．4） | 50.8 | （7．8） |
|  | Extremadura＊ | 87.2 | （2．8） | 6.1 | （2．0） | 6.7 | （1．9） | 59.8 | （6．7） | 25.9 | （6．5） | 14.3 | （5．2） | 55.9 | （7．3） | 22.3 | （6．7） | 21.8 | （5．0） |
|  | Galicia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 86.5 | （4．7） | 2.0 | （2．1） | 11.4 | （4．2） | 70.9 | （5．0） | 23.2 | （4．6） | 5.9 | （3．4） | 68.9 | （5．0） | 13.6 | （5．2） | 17.6 | （4．9） |
|  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 78.2 | （0．5） | 14.1 | （0．5） | 7.7 | （0．1） | 46.5 | （0．6） | 46.8 | （0．6） | 6.7 | （0．3） | 27.0 | （0．6） | 36.8 | （0．5） | 36.1 | （0．4） |
|  | Madrid ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 73.4 | （5．5） | 13.7 | （5．3） | 12.9 | （5．2） | 46.4 | （6．7） | 43.5 | （7．6） | 10.0 | （4．5） | 14.6 | （4．7） | 35.7 | （6．8） | 49.7 | （7．6） |
|  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 78.4 | （3．7） | 16.6 | （3．8） | 4.9 | （3．0） | 46.5 | （5．7） | 32.3 | （5．8） | 21.2 | （5．3） | 19.6 | （6．1） | 38.7 | （7．1） | 41.7 | （6．8） |
|  | Navarre• | 75.6 | （4．0） | 14.9 | （4．9） | 9.6 | （4．4） | 54.6 | （5．0） | 34.9 | （4．5） | 10.6 | （3．7） | 41.1 | （3．9） | 28.6 | （4．0） | 30.4 | （4．9） |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | England | 69.8 | （3．5） | 18.2 | （3．1） | 12.1 | （2．6） | 53.4 | （4．0） | 32.7 | （3．8） | 13.9 | （2．5） | 30.6 | （3．7） | 39.6 | （3．6） | 29.8 | （3．5） |
|  | Northern Ireland | 53.1 | （5．1） | 24.8 | （4．6） | 22.1 | （3．5） | 44.2 | （5．4） | 47.6 | （5．8） | 8.1 | （2．6） | 18.8 | （4．6） | 50.1 | （4．5） | 31.1 | （4．8） |
|  | Scotland ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 78.9 | （4．3） | 9.9 | （2．8） | 11.2 | （3．3） | 50.4 | （4．5） | 38.7 | （4．7） | 10.9 | （3．5） | 60.2 | （5．1） | 23.5 | （4．1） | 16.4 | （3．7） |
|  | Wales | 67.5 | （4．0） | 18.9 | （3．2） | 13.5 | （2．8） | 51.7 | （3．8） | 34.7 | （4．0） | 13.6 | （2．5） | 58.7 | （3．5） | 27.8 | （3．7） | 13.4 | （2．5） |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Connecticut ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 81.1 | （5．6） | 10.7 | （3．6） | 8.2 | （4．2） | 50.4 | （6．7） | 24.0 | （5．0） | 25.6 | （6．2） | 83.2 | （4．9） | 13.0 | （5．1） | 3.8 | （2．8） |
|  | Florida ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 69.2 | （7．2） | 25.4 | （7．4） | 5.5 | （3．2） | 21.9 | （7．2） | 44.7 | （8．5） | 33.3 | （8．3） | 70.8 | （6．7） | 22.9 | （6．5） | 6.3 | （6．1） |
|  | Massachusetts＊ | 80.4 | （6．4） | 17.7 | （6．0） | 1.9 | （1．9） | 54.7 | （7．4） | 30.8 | （6．5） | 14.5 | （5．7） | 93.0 | （3．6） | 5.0 | （3．0） | 2.0 | （2．0） |
| $\stackrel{\text { ñ }}{\stackrel{\text { n}}{2}}$ | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 25.7 | （7．7） | 36.1 | （8．4） | 38.2 | （7．5） | 37.3 | （6．8） | 36.1 | （5．9） | 26.6 | （6．8） | 15.5 | （6．1） | 19.8 | （5．8） | 64.7 | （8．3） |
|  | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acre | 71.3 | （9．3） | 22.5 | （9．3） | 6.2 | （4．6） | 64.8 | （9．5） | 24.7 | （8．6） | 10.4 | （6．3） | 76.4 | （8．5） | 18.5 | （8．4） | 5.1 | （4．0） |
|  | Alagoas | 73.0 | （10．2） | 12.9 | （7．6） | 14.1 | （7．7） | 60.6 | （9．9） | 21.7 | （8．2） | 17.7 | （8．1） | 86.1 | （5．8） | 13.9 | （5．8） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Amapá | 46.3 | （11．1） | 29.4 | （9．4） | 24.3 | （7．8） | 25.5 | （11．1） | 49.1 | （8．3） | 25.4 | （10．0） | 49.6 | （9．2） | 39.2 | （11．3） | 11.2 | （7．8） |
|  | Amazonas | 50.5 | （11．5） | 44.9 | （11．0） | 4.5 | （3．0） | 68.2 | （9．6） | 28.0 | （9．7） | 3.8 | （3．7） | 54.0 | （10．9） | 41.7 | （11．3） | 4.3 | （4．2） |
|  | Bahia | 52.5 | （11．9） | 23.0 | （9．7） | 24.5 | （9．7） | 52.4 | （15．7） | 40.3 | （16．0） | 7.3 | （6．4） | 46.7 | （15．7） | 40.6 | （15．5） | 12.7 | （8．0） |
|  | Ceará | 58.8 | （9．2） | 13.5 | （7．2） | 27.7 | （10．4） | 47.2 | （11．7） | 34.2 | （9．1） | 18.7 | （8．1） | 51.1 | （12．3） | 30.6 | （10．1） | 18.3 | （9．1） |
|  | Espírito Santo | 83.4 | （9．3） | 12.0 | （8．3） | 4.6 | （4．7） | 75.2 | （8．1） | 19.7 | （6．4） | 5.2 | （4．9） | 62.7 | （12．7） | 11.7 | （5．5） | 25.6 | （11．4） |
|  | Federal District | 55.1 | （6．9） | 31.6 | （12．8） | 13.3 | （9．6） | 47.8 | （11．4） | 43.7 | （14．8） | 8.6 | （8．7） | 71.6 | （13．2） | 14.4 | （11．2） | 13.9 | （7．3） |
|  | Goiás | 64.4 | （6．6） | 25.9 | （8．1） | 9.7 | （6．4） | 53.2 | （12．4） | 38.9 | （11．9） | 7.9 | （5．2） | 64.3 | （9．9） | 33.1 | （9．8） | 2.6 | （2．6） |
|  | Maranhão | 37.5 | （8．8） | 34.0 | （13．0） | 28.5 | （14．2） | 35.6 | （9．2） | 44.6 | （13．7） | 19.8 | （9．6） | 31.2 | （9．5） | 50.3 | （10．3） | 18.5 | （8．9） |
|  | Mato Grosso | 50.1 | （8．8） | 28.4 | （8．7） | 21.5 | （8．3） | 38.9 | （10．3） | 35.7 | （11．3） | 25.4 | （7．9） | 52.1 | （6．0） | 16.6 | （7．8） | 31.3 | （5．4） |
|  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 48.8 | （10．7） | 16.9 | （6．8） | 34.3 | （11．8） | 49.4 | （10．2） | 44.1 | （10．4） | 6.5 | （4．0） | 40.7 | （10．5） | 35.4 | （10．1） | 23.9 | （8．2） |
|  | Minas Gerais | 69.4 | （8．5） | 27.2 | （8．4） | 3.4 | （2．7） | 75.3 | （8．2） | 22.3 | （7．9） | 2.4 | （2．4） | 73.9 | （7．7） | 17.3 | （4．8） | 8.8 | （5．4） |
|  | Pará | 41.3 | （8．5） | 25.0 | （6．1） | 33.7 | （6．4） | 41.1 | （9．2） | 41.0 | （13．8） | 17.9 | （11．7） | 52.5 | （6．7） | 20.5 | （5．2） | 27.0 | （4．2） |
|  | Paraíba | 49.1 | （12．1） | 19.5 | （7．5） | 31.4 | （10．3） | 38.8 | （10．0） | 56.4 | （13．2） | 4.8 | （5．5） | 28.4 | （11．4） | 41.3 | （12．0） | 30.3 | （14．3） |
|  | Paraná | 80.3 | （9．7） | 12.0 | （6．3） | 7.8 | （7．7） | 60.1 | （10．4） | 34.3 | （11．3） | 5.6 | （5．2） | 56.0 | （10．2） | 44.0 | （10．2） | 0.0 | c |
|  | Pernambuco | 35.9 | （12．5） | 27.6 | （10．5） | 36.5 | （13．6） | 29.0 | （9．1） | 33.4 | （11．1） | 37.7 | （13．7） | 47.1 | （13．7） | 45.1 | （13．7） | 7.8 | （5．1） |
|  | Piauí | 50.2 | （8．7） | 18.5 | （8．3） | 31.3 | （10．3） | 31.0 | （10．2） | 42.2 | （14．2） | 26.8 | （10．2） | 29.0 | （10．6） | 28.4 | （8．7） | 42.5 | （13．4） |
|  | Rio de Janeiro | 61.0 | （10．5） | 15.1 | （7．6） | 23.9 | （9．0） | 47.2 | （8．6） | 31.5 | （7．5） | 21.3 | （7．5） | 55.3 | （11．5） | 38.9 | （10．1） | 5.8 | （5．1） |
|  | Rio Grande do Norte | 50.0 | （11．1） | 13.9 | （6．9） | 36.1 | （9．0） | 47.2 | （11．5） | 21.9 | （7．3） | 31.0 | （8．8） | 38.3 | （10．9） | 48.2 | （10．5） | 13.4 | （6．7） |
|  | Rio Grande do Sul | 73.6 | （6．3） | 6.9 | （5．0） | 19.6 | （4．0） | 64.2 | （8．9） | 27.4 | （8．0） | 8.4 | （5．1） | 71.5 | （10．0） | 24.9 | （8．8） | 3.6 | （5．1） |
|  | Rondônia | 58.5 | （11．1） | 27.8 | （10．9） | 13.7 | （7．4） | 47.5 | （9．9） | 46.7 | （10．1） | 5.7 | （5．5） | 64.9 | （11．2） | 15.5 | （6．9） | 19.6 | （9．9） |
|  | Roraima | 59.0 | （4．7） | 25.1 | （7．1） | 15.9 | （6．6） | 54.4 | （10．7） | 28.5 | （9．8） | 17.1 | （4．2） | 42.0 | （11．1） | 43.5 | （7．4） | 14.5 | （9．7） |
|  | Santa Catarina | 61.5 | （9．0） | 32.1 | （9．3） | 6.4 | （4．7） | 58.6 | （6．7） | 31.0 | （5．9） | 10.5 | （6．4） | 69.7 | （8．5） | 17.5 | （4．7） | 12.9 | （6．2） |
|  | São Paulo | 66.2 | （5．7） | 18.3 | （4．6） | 15.6 | （3．5） | 61.4 | （6．0） | 23.5 | （5．1） | 15.1 | （4．3） | 68.7 | （6．0） | 22.4 | （4．9） | 8.9 | （4．5） |
|  | Sergipe | 50.1 | （13．2） | 24.4 | （10．8） | 25.4 | （11．1） | 40.0 | （8．8） | 56.3 | （7．7） | 3.7 | （3．8） | 44.8 | （10．3） | 48.5 | （10．8） | 6.7 | （5．1） |
|  | Tocantins | 55.6 | （10．7） | 19.0 | （8．8） | 25.4 | （9．5） | 63.6 | （10．2） | 28.9 | （9．8） | 7.5 | （5．1） | 71.5 | （9．7） | 14.8 | （6．4） | 13.7 | （7．4） |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bogota | 70.4 | （6．2） | 10.4 | （3．3） | 19.2 | （5．4） | 57.9 | （6．9） | 36.1 | （7．1） | 6.0 | （3．5） | 38.9 | （6．8） | 39.9 | （8．2） | 21.2 | （6．2） |
|  | Cali | 53.6 | （9．2） | 18.0 | （5．3） | 28.4 | （7．6） | 44.2 | （8．5） | 36.5 | （6．9） | 19.3 | （7．6） | 27.4 | （6．9） | 38.2 | （9．1） | 34.4 | （6．4） |
|  | Manizales | 51.2 | （7．6） | 13.5 | （3．0） | 35.2 | （6．9） | 49.3 | （7．6） | 40.9 | （7．8） | 9.8 | （3．9） | 56.4 | （9．4） | 27.2 | （5．2） | 16.4 | （6．5） |
|  | Medellin | 48.3 | （7．5） | 19.0 | （6．0） | 32.7 | （6．7） | 51.1 | （7．8） | 28.8 | （7．6） | 20.2 | （6．5） | 27.2 | （6．6） | 39.0 | （8．4） | 33.8 | （6．7） |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perm Territory region ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 21.5 | （5．2） | 43.9 | （6．0） | 34.6 | （5．6） | 13.8 | （4．0） | 37.7 | （6．2） | 48.5 | （5．8） | 55.5 | （5．5） | 41.2 | （5．5） | 3.4 | （2．4） |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abu Dhabi＊ | 31.9 | （4．1） | 33.2 | （4．3） | 34.9 | （3．9） | 28.5 | （3．7） | 43.6 | （3．8） | 27.9 | （3．9） | 26.0 | （3．1） | 22.1 | （3．4） | 51.9 | （4．0） |
|  | Ajman | 12.8 | （4．0） | 27.0 | （2．6） | 60.2 | （4．4） | 23.1 | （6．2） | 35.9 | （6．3） | 41.0 | （5．6） | 21.2 | （6．0） | 54.1 | （7．3） | 24.7 | （7．6） |
|  | Dubai ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 18.1 | （0．3） | 38.6 | （0．2） | 43.3 | （0．2） | 26.1 | （0．3） | 47.2 | （0．3） | 26.7 | （0．1） | 8.0 | （0．1） | 37.0 | （0．2） | 55.0 | （0．2） |
|  | Fujairah | 21.8 | （6．5） | 21.7 | （7．2） | 56.5 | （6．1） | 7.9 | （3．6） | 60.6 | （6．4） | 31.5 | （4．8） | 54.8 | （2．7） | 18.8 | （1．4） | 26.4 | （2．5） |
|  | Ras Al Khaimah | 37.0 | （8．4） | 27.1 | （9．1） | 35.8 | （5．9） | 50.2 | （10．0） | 30.3 | （7．5） | 19.5 | （8．6） | 52.8 | （10．6） | 33.5 | （9．8） | 13.8 | （4．6） |
|  | Sharjah | 34.2 | （9．3） | 32.2 | （8．3） | 33.6 | （10．6） | 34.7 | （10．4） | 53.4 | （8．0） | 11.9 | （7．0） | 10.3 | （5．9） | 58.4 | （11．1） | 31.3 | （10．7） |
|  | Umm Al Quwain | 27.1 | （0．2） | 37.7 | （0．3） | 35.2 | （0．3） | 28.3 | （0．2） | 51.8 | （0．2） | 19.9 | （0．1） | 60.1 | （0．2） | 26.9 | （0．3） | 13.0 | （0．3） |

－PISA adjudicated region．
Note：See Table IV．2．7 for national data．
StatLink 商页解 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957536
[Part 5/6]
School admissions policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 2 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following factors are "never", "sometimes" or "always" considered for admission to school: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported whether "students' records of academic performance" and "recommendations of feeder schools" are considered for admission |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | These two factors are "never" considered |  | At least one of these two factors is "sometimes" considered but neither factor is "always" considered |  | At least one of these two factors is "always" considered |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 21.9 | (0.9) | 74.4 | (1.0) | 3.7 | (0.4) | 23.5 | (0.9) | 49.6 | (1.2) | 26.9 | (1.0) |
| - New South Wales | 29.9 | (3.5) | 57.3 | (3.7) | 12.8 | (2.5) | 12.1 | (2.5) | 32.1 | (3.5) | 55.7 | (3.8) |
| Northern territory | 65.0 | (9.2) | 27.4 | (2.3) | 7.6 | (8.4) | 21.0 | (6.1) | 54.8 | (9.9) | 24.3 | (8.9) |
| Queensland | 43.9 | (3.6) | 44.4 | (4.1) | 11.7 | (3.1) | 20.7 | (3.2) | 40.8 | (4.2) | 38.5 | (4.2) |
| South Australia | 30.9 | (4.5) | 64.1 | (4.8) | 5.0 | (2.3) | 15.5 | (3.2) | 42.7 | (5.2) | 41.8 | (4.9) |
| Tasmania | 38.1 | (1.4) | 50.2 | (1.4) | 11.7 | (0.9) | 26.5 | (1.9) | 41.1 | (1.5) | 32.5 | (1.7) |
| Victoria | 31.7 | (4.0) | 63.0 | (4.5) | 5.3 | (2.0) | 12.3 | (2.8) | 45.4 | (4.6) | 42.3 | (4.1) |
| Western Australia | 32.0 | (4.6) | 54.5 | (4.9) | 13.5 | (3.7) | 22.0 | (4.3) | 42.0 | (4.1) | 36.0 | (4.2) |
| Belgium e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 54.8 | (5.2) | 40.0 | (5.2) | 5.2 | (1.9) | 26.2 | (3.3) | 39.1 | (4.0) | 34.7 | (3.9) |
| French community | 53.7 | (7.4) | 34.1 | (6.9) | 12.2 | (4.0) | 47.3 | (4.9) | 36.5 | (4.7) | 16.2 | (3.2) |
| German-speaking community | 37.8 | (0.3) | 60.8 | (0.3) | 1.4 | (0.3) | 20.3 | (0.2) | 42.5 | (0.3) | 37.2 | (0.2) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 41.7 | (5.9) | 48.3 | (6.6) | 10.0 | (3.9) | 27.7 | (5.2) | 43.0 | (5.6) | 29.3 | (5.2) |
| British Columbia | 45.0 | (9.7) | 48.5 | (9.3) | 6.4 | (3.5) | 28.2 | (5.8) | 36.9 | (5.7) | 34.8 | (5.9) |
| Manitoba | 26.9 | (5.3) | 44.1 | (5.0) | 29.0 | (4.6) | 22.3 | (3.0) | 47.1 | (3.2) | 30.6 | (2.4) |
| New Brunswick | 30.0 | (3.3) | 70.0 | (3.3) | 0.0 | c | 50.7 | (2.8) | 34.4 | (2.0) | 14.9 | (3.2) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 59.8 | (5.0) | 36.1 | (4.9) | 4.1 | (0.4) | 49.7 | (4.5) | 18.9 | (1.0) | 31.4 | (4.0) |
| Nova Scotia | 35.1 | (10.1) | 30.4 | (9.2) | 34.5 | (17.1) | 38.8 | (7.1) | 20.9 | (5.0) | 40.3 | (9.1) |
| Ontario | 28.1 | (7.2) | 54.2 | (8.9) | 17.8 | (6.1) | 23.7 | (4.5) | 32.5 | (4.6) | 43.8 | (5.1) |
| Prince Edward Island | 77.9 | (0.4) | 22.1 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 31.4 | (0.5) | 24.8 | (0.4) | 43.9 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 60.8 | (5.8) | 32.0 | (5.5) | 7.2 | (3.1) | 24.1 | (4.0) | 32.6 | (3.6) | 43.2 | (3.5) |
| Saskatchewan | 63.7 | (4.6) | 29.1 | (4.2) | 7.3 | (1.8) | 34.4 | (4.1) | 38.2 | (3.0) | 27.3 | (2.8) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 24.6 | (8.3) | 65.4 | (9.6) | 10.0 | (7.5) | 9.4 | (3.7) | 11.3 | (4.6) | 79.3 | (5.9) |
| Basilicata | 39.1 | (7.4) | 56.2 | (6.6) | 4.7 | (4.6) | 17.8 | (3.3) | 21.9 | (5.1) | 60.3 | (4.8) |
| Bolzano | 62.6 | (0.7) | 29.9 | (0.8) | 7.5 | (0.4) | 64.9 | (0.9) | 19.3 | (0.6) | 15.7 | (1.1) |
| Calabria | 43.1 | (9.6) | 42.9 | (9.7) | 14.0 | (5.8) | 14.0 | (5.5) | 28.3 | (6.0) | 57.7 | (7.2) |
| Campania | 64.7 | (9.7) | 26.8 | (8.2) | 8.4 | (5.9) | 11.3 | (3.4) | 26.2 | (7.7) | 62.5 | (8.8) |
| Emilia Romagna | 70.0 | (9.5) | 22.4 | (8.5) | 7.5 | (5.3) | 10.1 | (5.2) | 12.9 | (4.3) | 76.9 | (6.2) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 31.3 | (5.3) | 61.3 | (6.4) | 7.4 | (3.6) | 8.3 | (3.6) | 17.5 | (3.4) | 74.2 | (4.7) |
| Lazio | 49.8 | (8.8) | 30.6 | (8.6) | 19.7 | (7.0) | 13.5 | (5.3) | 10.6 | (3.2) | 75.9 | (6.2) |
| Liguria | 57.9 | (8.6) | 32.2 | (7.3) | 9.9 | (6.3) | 8.7 | (4.2) | 29.1 | (6.0) | 62.1 | (7.3) |
| Lombardia | 45.6 | (9.1) | 47.3 | (8.9) | 7.1 | (4.4) | 15.1 | (4.9) | 22.1 | (7.8) | 62.8 | (7.6) |
| Marche | 38.3 | (9.0) | 47.8 | (7.9) | 13.9 | (6.5) | 13.8 | (2.9) | 6.9 | (3.5) | 79.3 | (4.5) |
| Molise | 38.3 | (1.2) | 40.5 | (1.2) | 21.2 | (0.9) | 0.0 |  | 39.7 | (0.9) | 60.3 | (0.9) |
| Piemonte | 45.0 | (6.6) | 46.5 | (7.3) | 8.5 | (4.4) | 12.3 | (4.9) | 31.3 | (6.1) | 56.4 | (8.5) |
| Puglia | 42.9 | (8.2) | 44.8 | (9.0) | 12.3 | (6.1) | 12.7 | (5.0) | 25.6 | (6.6) | 61.7 | (7.2) |
| Sardegna | 31.7 | (9.8) | 49.9 | (11.8) | 18.4 | (7.6) | 18.3 | (3.6) | 13.9 | (5.5) | 67.8 | (6.2) |
| Sicilia | 42.3 | (8.4) | 48.8 | (9.0) | 8.9 | (4.7) | 15.0 | (4.1) | 17.9 | (5.7) | 67.1 | (6.6) |
| Toscana | 47.3 | (10.6) | 43.3 | (11.2) | 9.3 | (3.5) | 16.8 | (5.7) | 27.1 | (6.7) | 56.0 | (8.1) |
| Trento | 53.9 | (4.5) | 31.2 | (5.1) | 14.9 | (4.0) | 10.4 | (1.3) | 30.8 | (4.9) | 58.8 | (4.9) |
| Umbria | 36.3 | (8.7) | 47.1 | (7.7) | 16.6 | (3.4) | 3.2 | (2.1) | 23.5 | (3.9) | 73.3 | (4.2) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 70.5 | (1.0) | 28.7 | (1.0) | 0.8 | (0.0) | 22.7 | (0.8) | 38.7 | (0.8) | 38.6 | (0.9) |
| Veneto | 43.5 | (9.3) | 40.1 | (9.3) | 16.4 | (4.9) | 7.0 | (3.7) | 18.3 | (4.2) | 74.8 | (5.5) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 45.4 | (7.0) | 50.8 | (7.6) | 3.8 | (2.3) | 11.0 | (4.5) | 19.0 | (4.4) | 70.1 | (5.4) |
| Baja California | 35.8 | (12.7) | 50.9 | (13.1) | 13.3 | (8.2) | 10.8 | (7.8) | 41.6 | (10.8) | 47.6 | (6.6) |
| Baja California Sur | 48.4 | (8.2) | 42.4 | (7.6) | 9.2 | (4.2) | 29.6 | (9.7) | 16.3 | (6.6) | 54.0 | (8.6) |
| Campeche | 55.0 | (8.4) | 32.3 | (11.4) | 12.7 | (9.7) | 39.3 | (6.9) | 16.6 | (7.9) | 44.1 | (9.1) |
| Chiapas | 71.9 | (11.0) | 23.8 | (10.6) | 4.2 | (4.0) | 27.9 | (7.4) | 24.5 | (6.5) | 47.6 | (9.5) |
| Chihuahua | 49.3 | (10.2) | 46.9 | (13.2) | 3.8 | (4.4) | 12.9 | (3.5) | 36.3 | (9.6) | 50.7 | (9.1) |
| Coahuila | 70.1 | (10.3) | 29.9 | (10.3) | 0.0 | c | 15.2 | (5.9) | 23.3 | (8.4) | 61.5 | (9.5) |
| Colima | 75.3 | (6.5) | 17.5 | (6.7) | 7.3 | (1.9) | 18.3 | (5.1) | 24.5 | (6.5) | 57.2 | (6.2) |
| Distrito Federal | 43.5 | (11.6) | 42.1 | (10.9) | 14.4 | (9.9) | 34.1 | (10.0) | 27.7 | (9.3) | 38.2 | (8.1) |
| Durango | 71.4 | (8.6) | 22.7 | (7.4) | 6.0 | (4.5) | 16.5 | (6.1) | 19.6 | (7.2) | 63.8 | (7.6) |
| Guanajuato | 48.8 | (9.4) | 51.2 | (9.4) | 0.0 | c | 35.9 | (6.7) | 5.4 | (2.8) | 58.7 | (7.0) |
| Guerrero | 74.5 | (11.2) | 25.5 | (11.2) | 0.0 | c | 24.0 | (7.2) | 28.4 | (8.9) | 47.6 | (7.0) |
| Hidalgo | 88.3 | (3.0) | 8.5 | (3.7) | 3.2 | (3.2) | 22.1 | (6.7) | 15.4 | (5.0) | 62.5 | (7.5) |
| Jalisco | 75.7 | (7.7) | 17.2 | (6.0) | 7.1 | (4.3) | 37.1 | (7.0) | 12.8 | (2.8) | 50.0 | (6.5) |
| Mexico | 55.4 | (8.8) | 36.9 | (7.8) | 7.7 | (7.0) | 28.6 | (7.9) | 24.0 | (6.4) | 47.4 | (8.3) |
| Morelos | 62.7 | (8.9) | 29.3 | (8.7) | 8.0 | (4.3) | 17.4 | (5.9) | 18.0 | (6.8) | 64.6 | (8.0) |
| Nayarit | 67.6 | (8.5) | 23.0 | (8.4) | 9.4 | (5.3) | 27.9 | (4.5) | 18.1 | (4.5) | 54.0 | (5.8) |
| Nuevo León | 54.0 | (10.6) | 42.0 | (10.3) | 4.1 | (4.1) | 26.1 | (8.7) | 18.7 | (5.5) | 55.2 | (9.5) |
| Puebla | 80.4 | (7.2) | 16.8 | (6.5) | 2.8 | (2.8) | 25.6 | (6.4) | 28.3 | (7.0) | 46.2 | (5.1) |
| Querétaro | 47.7 | (9.8) | 39.8 | (10.5) | 12.5 | (3.2) | 26.6 | (8.7) | 13.7 | (3.2) | 59.7 | (10.0) |
| Quintana Roo | 34.4 | (11.6) | 52.4 | (8.5) | 13.3 | (9.1) | 20.9 | (5.4) | 31.2 | (5.9) | 47.9 | (7.0) |
| San Luis Potosí | 60.9 | (7.0) | 31.9 | (11.5) | 7.2 | (7.0) | 34.3 | (9.6) | 16.5 | (5.6) | 49.2 | (10.8) |
| Sinaloa | 56.9 | (10.1) | 29.2 | (9.9) | 13.9 | (8.0) | 11.6 | (4.2) | 23.9 | (7.2) | 64.6 | (7.7) |
| Tabasco | 42.8 | (10.2) | 55.7 | (10.0) | 1.5 | (1.5) | 28.4 | (8.9) | 25.8 | (8.5) | 45.8 | (8.3) |
| Tamaulipas | 60.3 | (14.3) | 38.0 | (14.4) | 1.7 | (1.7) | 10.1 | (4.9) | 27.8 | (6.1) | 62.1 | (7.4) |
| Tlaxcala | 76.3 | (7.6) | 17.7 | (5.7) | 6.0 | (4.7) | 34.0 | (6.3) | 8.1 | (4.1) | 57.9 | (7.4) |
| Veracruz | 91.5 | (4.9) | 5.9 | (4.2) | 2.7 | (2.6) | 43.1 | (9.0) | 23.8 | (8.5) | 33.0 | (6.1) |
| Yucatán | 61.5 | (8.8) | 35.6 | (9.6) | 2.9 | (2.9) | 21.8 | (6.9) | 28.2 | (9.6) | 49.9 | (10.2) |
| Zacatecas | 61.8 | (10.2) | 31.6 | (10.1) | 6.5 | (3.0) | 28.1 | (7.8) | 18.8 | (5.5) | 53.1 | (7.1) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.7 for national data
StatLink 部宁ㅁ http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 6/6]
School admissions policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 2 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the following factors are "never", "sometimes" or "always" considered for admission to school: |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported whether "students' records of academic performance" and "recommendations of feeder schools" are considered for admission |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Never |  | Sometimes |  | Always |  | These two factors are "never" considered |  | At least one of these two factors is "sometimes" considered but neither factor is "always" considered |  | At least one of these two factors is "always" considered |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| O Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 37.1 | (13.6) | 54.2 | (14.8) | 8.6 | (7.3) | 53.8 | (12.9) | 22.8 | (10.6) | 23.4 | (8.0) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 45.1 | (8.0) | 26.7 | (6.9) | 28.2 | (7.4) | 80.8 | (5.4) | 11.4 | (4.7) | 7.8 | (3.9) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 59.9 | (6.6) | 19.6 | (6.8) | 20.5 | (5.1) | 89.0 | (4.9) | 8.9 | (4.4) | 2.1 | (2.1) |
| Asturias* | 40.0 | (7.9) | 43.9 | (8.4) | 16.2 | (7.0) | 88.2 | (3.6) | 11.8 | (3.6) | 0.0 | c |
| Balearic Islands* | 45.3 | (9.4) | 32.6 | (8.0) | 22.1 | (6.5) | 90.1 | (4.2) | 6.6 | (3.5) | 3.3 | (2.4) |
| Basque Country* | 32.7 | (4.3) | 38.5 | (4.2) | 28.8 | (4.1) | 62.8 | (4.2) | 24.3 | (3.7) | 12.9 | (2.4) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 38.7 | (8.4) | 33.4 | (8.3) | 27.9 | (8.0) | 93.9 | (3.6) | 3.9 | (2.8) | 2.3 | (2.2) |
| Castile and Leon* | 45.9 | (7.1) | 38.0 | (7.6) | 16.2 | (5.5) | 84.6 | (5.3) | 14.4 | (5.2) | 1.0 | (1.0) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 44.1 | (6.2) | 23.4 | (7.0) | 32.6 | (8.6) | 88.1 | (4.2) | 11.9 | (4.2) | 0.0 | c |
| Extremadura* | 57.0 | (7.4) | 18.0 | (6.6) | 25.0 | (5.3) | 89.8 | (4.5) | 6.1 | (3.5) | 4.2 | (2.9) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.3 | (6.1) | 34.9 | (7.2) | 33.8 | (7.3) | 92.4 | (3.9) | 4.3 | (3.0) | 3.3 | (2.4) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 32.1 | (0.6) | 63.7 | (0.7) | 4.3 | (0.2) | 70.2 | (0.5) | 28.9 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.1) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 15.1 | (6.5) | 52.3 | (10.3) | 32.6 | (8.6) | 70.9 | (7.0) | 25.4 | (6.5) | 3.8 | (2.7) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 37.6 | (8.0) | 36.5 | (8.4) | 25.9 | (7.8) | 81.8 | (5.2) | 16.3 | (4.9) | 1.9 | (1.9) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 49.6 | (6.9) | 36.0 | (5.3) | 14.4 | (4.8) | 78.1 | (4.5) | 18.2 | (3.6) | 3.7 | (2.6) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 40.2 | (5.1) | 35.1 | (5.0) | 24.7 | (4.7) | 52.7 | (3.7) | 20.0 | (4.0) | 27.3 | (3.3) |
| Northern Ireland | 37.7 | (5.6) | 52.6 | (5.7) | 9.7 | (3.9) | 23.6 | (4.6) | 18.9 | (4.6) | 57.5 | (4.0) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 41.5 | (5.9) | 52.0 | (5.8) | 6.4 | (2.3) | 58.8 | (5.1) | 13.6 | (3.4) | 27.6 | (4.3) |
| Wales | 46.0 | (4.7) | 38.4 | (4.4) | 15.6 | (3.3) | 57.5 | (4.1) | 17.1 | (3.3) | 25.3 | (3.6) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 57.2 | (10.3) | 20.3 | (7.6) | 22.5 | (9.1) | 43.9 | (6.4) | 3.1 | (2.3) | 53.0 | (5.8) |
| Florida ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 54.9 | (9.5) | 34.9 | (8.6) | 10.2 | (5.9) | 33.9 | (8.1) | 34.8 | (7.6) | 31.3 | (7.3) |
| Massachusetts* | 63.3 | (9.1) | 19.2 | (9.0) | 17.5 | (8.3) | 47.0 | (8.6) | 11.0 | (4.7) | 42.0 | (7.7) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| § Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 34.5 | (10.3) | 45.9 | (10.7) | 19.6 | (8.3) | 25.4 | (5.1) | 33.3 | (6.9) | 41.3 | (7.7) |
| \% Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 46.0 | (13.0) | 42.8 | (13.5) | 11.2 | (11.8) | 60.6 | (11.3) | 7.4 | (4.1) | 32.0 | (10.8) |
| Alagoas | 50.1 | (12.1) | 34.8 | (11.6) | 15.0 | (10.7) | 39.5 | (11.7) | 13.0 | (7.9) | 47.5 | (12.9) |
| Amapá | 16.3 | (5.8) | 67.0 | (10.8) | 16.7 | (8.3) | 28.6 | (7.8) | 39.2 | (9.3) | 32.2 | (11.6) |
| Amazonas | 22.1 | (10.1) | 58.7 | (11.4) | 19.2 | (9.5) | 61.4 | (9.1) | 22.4 | (9.2) | 16.3 | (4.7) |
| Bahia | 13.2 | (8.6) | 44.1 | (13.9) | 42.6 | (16.5) | 44.6 | (11.1) | 25.2 | (11.1) | 30.2 | (13.0) |
| Ceará | 30.2 | (10.1) | 39.0 | (13.1) | 30.8 | (13.4) | 43.6 | (9.5) | 25.9 | (9.3) | 30.5 | (8.1) |
| Espírito Santo | 35.7 | (16.7) | 25.2 | (16.4) | 39.2 | (8.1) | 72.2 | (7.6) | 22.3 | (9.5) | 5.6 | (3.9) |
| Federal District | 25.2 | (13.7) | 62.8 | (11.6) | 12.0 | (9.5) | 66.8 | (10.8) | 17.5 | (7.6) | 15.7 | (7.8) |
| Goiás | 42.2 | (10.7) | 32.6 | (9.2) | 25.2 | (10.3) | 51.1 | (10.0) | 21.9 | (7.8) | 27.0 | (7.5) |
| Maranhão | 28.7 | (15.8) | 68.4 | (16.2) | 2.9 | (2.8) | 36.3 | (12.8) | 24.4 | (13.5) | 39.3 | (11.5) |
| Mato Grosso | 38.3 | (9.2) | 33.2 | (10.6) | 28.5 | (13.0) | 47.0 | (10.9) | 19.4 | (8.9) | 33.6 | (9.8) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 21.1 | (9.0) | 57.7 | (11.3) | 21.2 | (7.6) | 59.9 | (9.8) | 23.0 | (9.2) | 17.1 | (7.7) |
| Minas Gerais | 24.3 | (9.6) | 48.3 | (9.6) | 27.5 | (10.7) | 62.4 | (7.7) | 15.2 | (5.5) | 22.4 | (7.1) |
| Pará | 24.3 | (8.9) | 49.7 | (15.7) | 26.0 | (14.0) | 38.7 | (8.8) | 42.9 | (4.4) | 18.3 | (8.3) |
| Paraíba | 27.6 | (10.0) | 40.6 | (13.7) | 31.8 | (14.7) | 54.8 | (12.2) | 23.4 | (10.7) | 21.8 | (6.1) |
| Paraná | 38.8 | (12.3) | 45.9 | (10.8) | 15.3 | (6.6) | 55.3 | (13.0) | 30.2 | (10.6) | 14.5 | (9.2) |
| Pernambuco | 49.3 | (17.4) | 41.5 | (14.7) | 9.2 | (8.6) | 34.7 | (10.1) | 19.2 | (7.0) | 46.1 | (11.5) |
| Piauí | 22.2 | (11.6) | 67.1 | (14.2) | 10.7 | (7.7) | 11.1 | (5.3) | 30.4 | (10.1) | 58.5 | (10.0) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 19.8 | (10.7) | 43.1 | (11.9) | 37.1 | (13.6) | 52.4 | (11.2) | 28.0 | (8.7) | 19.6 | (9.2) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 22.1 | (11.6) | 54.8 | (13.1) | 23.1 | (11.4) | 62.0 | (10.5) | 20.0 | (7.7) | 18.1 | (8.8) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 57.9 | (11.3) | 24.9 | (9.7) | 17.2 | (8.8) | 71.2 | (9.3) | 8.7 | (5.2) | 20.1 | (8.1) |
| Rondônia | 19.5 | (9.7) | 30.1 | (12.0) | 50.4 | (14.0) | 57.1 | (8.9) | 17.4 | (5.0) | 25.4 | (8.8) |
| Roraima | 20.1 | (9.5) | 48.6 | (12.4) | 31.3 | (11.9) | 51.9 | (8.9) | 20.6 | (6.5) | 27.5 | (10.1) |
| Santa Catarina | 44.2 | (11.9) | 44.3 | (12.7) | 11.5 | (6.6) | 80.5 | (7.3) | 17.4 | (7.1) | 2.0 | (2.1) |
| São Paulo | 34.0 | (7.8) | 41.7 | (7.4) | 24.2 | (5.5) | 60.9 | (6.3) | 28.5 | (5.2) | 10.6 | (3.7) |
| Sergipe | 29.8 | (13.8) | 27.1 | (14.5) | 43.2 | (17.7) | 35.6 | (8.5) | 22.0 | (10.6) | 42.4 | (11.2) |
| Tocantins | 60.9 | (11.3) | 26.8 | (10.7) | 12.3 | (6.1) | 31.4 | (7.9) | 17.6 | (4.9) | 51.1 | (8.6) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 47.1 | (8.3) | 35.4 | (8.7) | 17.4 | (8.0) | 50.1 | (5.9) | 25.8 | (6.2) | 24.1 | (5.0) |
| Cali | 32.0 | (7.7) | 55.7 | (8.2) | 12.2 | (5.0) | 18.7 | (5.8) | 36.7 | (8.0) | 44.6 | (6.6) |
| Manizales | 25.5 | (7.4) | 48.7 | (9.2) | 25.8 | (11.7) | 24.3 | (6.5) | 28.4 | (7.4) | 47.3 | (8.4) |
| Medellin | 34.0 | (8.6) | 54.1 | (9.0) | 12.0 | (6.7) | 21.0 | (5.7) | 44.4 | (8.0) | 34.7 | (6.5) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 23.6 | (5.7) | 72.1 | (6.2) | 4.3 | (2.7) | 28.0 | (5.4) | 47.5 | (6.7) | 24.5 | (5.7) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 22.7 | (3.7) | 59.6 | (4.4) | 17.7 | (3.5) | 10.4 | (2.6) | 27.1 | (3.3) | 62.5 | (3.3) |
| Ajman | 16.6 | (6.7) | 72.0 | (8.1) | 11.3 | (6.3) | 0.0 | c | 26.5 | (4.2) | 73.5 | (4.2) |
| Dubai ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 42.9 | (0.3) | 46.6 | (0.3) | 10.4 | (0.1) | 1.6 | (0.0) | 10.7 | (0.1) | 87.7 | (0.1) |
| Fujairah | 39.4 | (12.5) | 57.4 | (12.5) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 5.8 | (3.6) | 24.1 | (6.1) | 70.1 | (6.2) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 20.7 | (11.3) | 72.6 | (12.9) | 6.6 | (6.3) | 17.5 | (7.0) | 34.7 | (7.4) | 47.8 | (10.1) |
| Sharjah | 20.5 | (8.1) | 77.0 | (8.1) | 2.5 | (1.7) | 0.0 | c | 30.1 | (7.6) | 69.9 | (7.6) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 29.4 | (0.5) | 70.3 | (0.6) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 17.7 | (0.2) | 36.3 | (0.4) | 46.0 | (0.3) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.7 for national data.
StatLink 可itisu http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
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Note: See Table IV.2.9 for national data
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|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds would be transferred to another school for the following reasons: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low academic achievement |  |  |  |  |  | High academic achievement |  |  |  |  |  | Behavioural problems |  |  |  |  |  | Special learning needs |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Alentejo | 93.1 | (4.5) | 6.9 | (4.5) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | c\| | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c\| | 81.3 | (7.0) | 18.7 | (7.0) | 0.0 | c\| | 84.9 | (7.0) | 10.7 | (5.9) | 4.4 | (3.9) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 76.8 | (5.4) | 23.2 | (5.4) | 0.0 | c | 89.6 | (3.7) | 10.4 | (3.7) | 0.0 | c |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 98.7 | (1.2) | 1.3 | (1.2) | 0.0 | c | c 98.4 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 1.6 | (1.5) | 87.8 | (5.0) | 12.2 | (5.0) | 0.0 | c | 73.5 | (6.4) | 26.5 | (6.4) | 0.0 | c |
| Asturias* | 100.0 | (0.0) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | c 99.0 | (0.7) | 1.0 | (0.7) | 0.0 | c | 62.9 | (7.0) | 37.1 | (7.0) | 0.0 | c | 93.1 | (3.5) | 6.9 | (3.5) | 0.0 | c |
| Balearic Islands* | 98.3 | (1.8) | 1.7 | (1.8) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 84.3 | (5.5) | 15.7 | (5.5) | 0.0 | c | 88.2 | (4.9) | 9.4 | (4.3) | 2.4 | (2.4) |
| Basque Country* | 86.1 | (2.6) | 12.1 | (2.4) | 1.9 | (1.1) | 94.3 |  | 5.0 | (1.6) | 0.6 | (0.6) | 77.1 | (3.2) | 20.9 | (3.0) | 2.0 | (1.1) | 71.3 | (3.4) | 23.0 | (3.2) | 5.7 | (1.5) |
| Cantabria* | 96.0 | (2.8) | 4.0 | (2.8) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 63.2 | (5.8) | 32.5 | (5.9) | 4.3 | (3.0) | 80.2 | (5.4) | 19.8 | (5.4) | 0.0 | c |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 95.9 | (2.9) | 4.1 | (2.9) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 81.7 | (5.0) | 15.6 | (4.6) | 2.8 | (2.3) | 82.1 | (5.6) | 12.7 | (4.8) | 5.3 | (3.0) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 100.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 72.3 | (7.0) | 25.3 | (6.6) | 2.4 | (2.4) | 70.4 | (6.5) | 27.0 | (6.1) | 2.6 | (2.5) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 97.9 | (2.1) | 0.0 | c | 2.1 | (2.1) | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 88.3 | (4.7) | 9.6 | (4.1) | 2.1 | (2.1) | 86.9 | (5.2) | 8.8 | (4.2) | 4.3 | (3.0) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 95.9 | (2.9) | 4.1 | (2.9) | 0.0 |  | c 92.7 | (3.7) | 5.4 | (3.1) | 1.9 | (1.9) | 78.8 | (5.0) | 21.2 | (5.0) | 0.0 | c | 90.8 | (3.1) | 7.3 | (3.7) | 1.9 | (1.9) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 100.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | c 93.1 | (0.3) | 6.9 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 66.1 | (0.6) | 33.9 | (0.6) | 0.0 | c | 83.5 | (0.5) | 16.5 | (0.5) | 0.0 | c |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 93.1 | (3.9) | 6.9 | (3.9) | 0.0 |  | c 95.3 | (2.9) | 2.4 | (2.4) | 2.3 | (1.6) | 78.2 | (5.5) | 21.8 | (5.5) | 0.0 | c | 73.2 | (6.0) | 16.9 | (5.8) | 9.9 | (4.6) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 97.7 | (2.3) | 2.3 | (2.3) | 0.0 |  | c 93.7 | (3.7) | 6.3 | (3.7) | 0.0 | c | 60.5 | (6.4) | 37.5 | (6.2) | 2.1 | (2.0) | 88.8 | (5.0) | 11.2 | (5.0) | 0.0 | c |
| Navarre* | 92.4 | (3.7) | 7.6 | (3.7) | 0.0 |  | c 94.8 | (2.0) | 5.2 | (2.0) | 0.0 | c | 70.1 | (4.3) | 28.2 | (3.9) | 1.7 | (1.7) | 75.5 | (4.9) | 19.5 | (4.6) | 5.0 | (1.9) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 95.6 | (1.9) | 2.5 | (1.6) | 1.8 | (1.1) | 96.7 | (1.3) | 3.3 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | 69.8 | (4.7) | 27.5 | (4.2) | 2.7 | (1.4) | 95.5 | (1.9) | 4.5 | (1.9) | 0.0 | c |
| Northern Ireland | 92.3 | (2.7) | 5.3 | (2.1) | 2.4 | (1.7) | 92.3 | (2.5) | 7.1 | (2.4) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 83.6 | (3.8) | 15.0 | (3.8) | 1.4 | (0.1) | 96.4 | (1.5) | 2.5 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (1.1) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 98.5 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.8) | 0.7 | (0.8) | 98.7 | (1.1) | 0.6 | (0.9) | 0.7 | (0.8) | 86.1 | (3.4) | 10.6 | (3.2) | 3.3 | (1.7) | 97.5 | (1.5) | 0.7 | (0.8) | 1.7 | (1.3) |
| Wales | 97.8 | (1.3) | 1.5 | (1.1) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 96.3 | (1.7) | 3.0 | (1.5) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 71.5 | (3.2) | 26.6 | (3.3) | 1.9 | (1.2) | 94.4 | (1.9) | 4.9 | (1.8) | 0.7 | (0.7) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 100.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 98.1 |  | 1.9 | (1.9) | 0.0 |  | 88.8 | (3.8) | 11.2 | (3.8) | 0.0 |  | 92.2 | (2.6) | 7.8 | (2.6) | 0.0 | c |
| Florida• | 95.9 | (2.4) | 4.1 | (2.4) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | c | 52.6 | (7.8) | 47.4 | (7.8) | 0.0 |  | 85.9 | (5.4) | 11.7 | (4.9) | 2.3 | (2.3) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 97.5 | (2.6) | 2.5 | (2.6) | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 87.4 | (5.1) | 12.6 | (5.1) | 0.0 | c | 83.1 | (5.9) | 16.9 | (5.9) | 0.0 | c |


| Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| § Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 65.9 (7.3)\| | 29.2 (6.4)\| | 4.8 (3.6)\| | \| 96.6 (2.6)| | 3.4 (2.6) | 0.0 c | \| 19.1 (6.8)| | \| 70.4 (7.9)| | 10.5 (4.9)\| | 32.7 (7.2)\| | 52.9 (7.5)\| | 14.4 |
| ๕ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 93.6 (2.7) | 6.4 (2.7) | 0.0 c 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 c | 0.0 c | 43.7 (7.9) | 36.7 (8.9) | 19.6 (11.2) | 83.2 (8.4) | 16.8 (8.4) | 0.0 |
| Alagoas | 82.6 (6.1) | 17.4 (6.1) | 0.0 c | 92.5 (5.1) | 7.5 (5.1) | 0.0 | 36.7 (11.0) | 63.3 (11.0) | 0.0 | 80.6 (12.3) | 5.1 (4.1) | 14.2 (12.2) |
| Amapá | 90.7 (5.9) | 9.3 (5.9) | $0.0 \quad \mathrm{c}$ | c 93.5 (4.5) | 6.5 (4.5) | 0.0 | 24.2 (10.5) | 71.5 (10.5) | 4.3 (3.4) | 86.9 (6.7) | 13.1 (6.7) | 0.0 |
| Amazonas | 86.4 (8.5) | 10.9 (8.0) | 2.7 (2.7) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 c | 0.0 | 25.3 (7.3) | 49.7 (11.5) | 25.0 (9.9) | 51.3 (9.3) | 47.6 (9.2) | 1.0 (1.0) |
| Bahia | 71.5 (8.2) | 18.7 (10.4) | 9.8 (10.7) | 96.8 (3.0) | 3.2 (3.0) | 0.0 | 42.3 (16.8) | 57.7 (16.8) | 0.0 | 77.5 (16.2) | 22.5 (16.2) | 0.0 |
| Ceará | 88.6 (6.9) | 11.4 (6.9) | 0.0 c | c 88.5 (8.5) | 11.5 (8.5) | 0.0 | 39.2 (9.7) | 52.8 (9.9) | 8.0 (7.4) | 71.5 (11.5) | 28.5 (11.5) | 0.0 |
| Espírito Santo | 73.3 (8.4) | 20.8 (7.5) | 5.8 (4.1) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.9 (8.3) | 46.6 (14.1) | 17.6 (9.8) | 88.5 (6.9) | 11.5 (6.9) | 0.0 |
| Federal District | 83.9 (8.7) | 5.5 (5.4) | 10.6 (7.1) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 (12.2) | 60.5 (7.3) | 22.8 (12.6) | 68.8 (11.4) | 23.2 (10.6) | 8.0 (5.5) |
| Goiás | 74.0 (9.5) | 23.1 (9.2) | 2.8 (2.8) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.4 (9.8) | 52.2 (11.4) | 23.4 (10.8) | 67.6 (11.6) | 29.9 (11.2) | 2.5 (2.4) |
| Maranhão | 63.9 (14.8) | 25.2 (12.6) | 10.9 (9.9) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 (9.9) | 76.5 (11.0) | 5.3 (5.2) | 49.4 (15.0) | 50.6 (15.0) | 0.0 |
| Mato Grosso | 72.7 (8.8) | 14.9 (8.6) | 12.5 (6.8) | 91.0 (6.8) | 6.0 (6.1) | 2.9 (2.9) | 40.7 (11.3) | 40.3 (9.8) | 19.0 (10.3) | 74.5 (9.2) | 22.4 (8.7) | 3.1 (3.1) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 62.0 (9.3) | 22.6 (9.2) | 15.3 (3.0) | 97.3 (2.9) | 2.7 (2.9) | 0.0 | 35.4 (9.4) | 62.6 (8.6) | 2.1 (2.2) | 71.2 (8.3) | 23.1 (8.4) | 5.7 (3.4) |
| Minas Gerais | 71.0 (8.1) | 23.6 (9.6) | 5.5 (4.2) | 93.4 (4.6) | 6.6 (4.6) | 0.0 | 39.3 (9.4) | 52.2 (9.0) | 8.6 (5.3) | 66.4 (7.5) | 33.6 (7.5) | 0.0 |
| Pará | 85.5 (13.0) | 14.5 (13.0) | 0.0 c | c 97.6 (1.2) | 0.0 | 2.4 (1.2) | 34.9 (12.8) | 60.7 (13.3) | 4.4 (3.7) | 82.5 (9.8) | 17.5 (9.8) | 0.0 |
| Paraíba | 79.8 (11.2) | 15.9 (9.2) | 4.3 (4.8) 1 | 100.0 c | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 (10.3) | 57.0 (12.2) | 24.9 (15.6) | 78.0 (9.3) | 17.7 (7.1) | 4.3 (4.8) |
| Paraná | 87.7 (8.8) | 12.3 (8.8) | 0.0 c | c 91.1 (8.7) | 0.0 | 8.9 (8.7) | 48.8 (7.9) | 51.2 (7.9) | 0.0 c | 66.2 (13.1) | 33.8 (13.1) | 0.0 |
| Pernambuco | 90.0 (5.7) | 4.6 (3.3) | 5.4 (4.3) 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 c | 0.0 | 35.3 (9.2) | 45.8 (10.6) | 18.9 (7.8) | 57.8 (12.0) | 25.7 (10.5) | 16.5 (9.3) |
| Piauí | 58.8 (10.5) | 25.6 (9.9) | 15.6 (4.4) | 91.0 (6.1) | 9.0 (6.1) | 0.0 | 25.2 (12.5) | 56.4 (9.5) | 18.5 (11.7) | 56.3 (13.5) | 38.2 (14.6) | 5.5 (4.5) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 72.4 (9.4) | 18.7 (7.8) | 8.9 (7.3) | 84.0 (8.8) | 4.5 (4.5) | 11.5 (7.2) | 45.7 (8.4) | 28.4 (9.9) | 25.9 (9.3) | 71.7 (9.6) | 23.3 (9.6) | 5.0 (5.9) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 72.6 (9.8) | 17.9 (11.5) | 9.5 (6.9) | 91.9 (8.3) | 8.1 (8.3) | 0.0 c | 36.4 (11.7) | 48.1 (13.7) | 15.5 (9.6) | 88.5 (6.1) | 11.5 (6.1) | 0.0 |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 72.9 (11.3) | 22.0 (9.0) | 5.2 (3.8) | 85.6 (8.8) | 5.2 (3.8) | 9.3 (5.9) | 43.4 (11.9) | 45.8 (9.0) | 10.8 (5.5) | 73.4 (10.1) | 26.6 (10.1) | 0.0 |
| Rondônia | 81.1 (10.2) | 18.9 (10.2) | 0.0 | 94.9 (5.3) | 5.1 (5.3) | 0.0 c | 42.8 (11.8) | 57.2 (11.8) | 0.0 | 74.6 (7.9) | 25.4 (7.9) | 0.0 |
| Roraima | 55.3 (9.1) | 36.7 (10.6) | 8.0 (7.7) | 94.9 (5.1) | 0.0 c | 5.1 (5.1) | 30.7 (9.2) | 64.5 (10.4) | 4.7 (4.6) | 57.1 (11.7) | 30.0 (8.2) | 12.9 (9.0) |
| Santa Catarina | 67.0 (10.4) | 28.3 (8.9) | 4.7 (4.9) | 95.0 (5.0) | 0.0 c | 5.0 (5.0) | 32.0 (9.9) | 50.5 (11.8) | 17.4 (8.8) | 95.0 (5.0) | 0.0 | 5.0 (5.0) |
| São Paulo | 82.5 (4.5) | 12.8 (4.4) | 4.7 (2.8) | 91.8 (3.7) | 5.5 (3.2) | 2.7 (2.0) | 51.4 (6.3) | 42.2 (6.1) | 6.3 (3.3) | 80.7 (5.5) | 16.4 (5.2) | 2.9 (2.0) |
| Sergipe | 50.3 (12.0) | 30.2 (11.1) | 19.5 (9.0) | 76.7 (12.9) | 16.4 (10.2) | 6.9 (6.7) | 26.0 (12.1) | 46.1 (16.4) | 27.9 (14.5) | 42.7 (12.1) | 57.3 (12.1) | 0.0 |
| Tocantins | 70.1 (10.7) | 24.1 (10.7) | 5.8 (1.0) | 88.7 (6.6) | 11.3 (6.6) | 0.0 c | 27.4(11.4) | 63.6 (9.6) | 9.0 (5.1) | 56.6 (11.3) | 28.4 (8.2) | 15.0 (6.8) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 75.7 (5.5) | 22.9 (5.6) | 1.5 (1.6) | 78.7 (4.8) | 15.1 (4.1) | 6.3 (3.3) | 34.8 (6.9) | 56.9 (7.7)\| | 8.3 (4.8) | 24.5 (6.9) | 72.3 (6.8) | 3.1 (2.2) |
| Cali | 76.6 (5.4) | 19.8 (5.8) | 3.6 (2.1) | 76.9 (7.5) | 20.5 (7.3) | 2.5 (2.0) | 34.6 (8.0) | 61.7 (7.6) | 3.7 (2.8) | 26.0 (6.0) | 63.4 (7.2) | 10.6 (5.4) |
| Manizales | 49.8 (7.7) | 42.9 (7.8) | 7.3 (4.0) | 84.4 (5.8) | 15.6 (5.8) | 0.0 c | 32.8 (8.0) | 61.3 (7.2) | 6.0 (3.7) | 41.5 (6.8) | 43.5 (7.5) | $15.0 \quad$ (4.6) |
| Medellin | 54.1 (7.8) | 42.3 (7.7) | 3.6 (2.6) | 78.9 (6.1) | 15.5 (4.9) | 5.6 (5.4) | 26.7 (7.8) | 66.4 (8.4) | 6.8 (3.4) | 40.9 (7.3) | 54.7 (7.8) | 4.4 (2.8) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 87.7 (4.7)\| | 11.0 (4.5)\| | 1.3 (1.3) | 69.3 (4.7) | 21.3 (5.0)\| | 9.4 (3.2)\| | 85.5 (3.5)\| | 14.5 (3.5)\| | 0.0 | 38.0 (7.5) | 53.8 (7.1)\| | 8.2 |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 62.2 (4.1) | 33.8 (3.6) | 4.1 (1.8) | 75.8 (3.3) | 20.1 (2.8) | 4.0 (2.0) | 35.8 (4.7) | 50.3 (4.9)\| | 13.9 (2.9) | 55.4 (3.9) | 42.4 (3.6) | 2.2 (1.5) |
| Ajman | 65.5 (5.5) | 34.5 (5.5) | 0.0 c | c 53.1 (8.4) | 41.4 (8.0) | 5.5 (5.2) | 34.7 (7.1) | 44.0 (7.2) | 21.3 (6.2) | 55.5 (6.9) | 44.5 (6.9) | 0.0 |
| Dubai* | 73.4 (0.1) | 21.1 (0.1) | 5.5 (0.0) | 85.5 (0.3) | 10.5 (0.1) | 3.9 (0.3) | 54.3 (0.2) | 35.7 (0.2) | 9.9 (0.1) | 73.6 (0.1) | 18.3 (0.1) | 8.1 (0.1) |
| Fujairah | 87.2 (0.6) | 7.3 (0.3) | 5.5 (0.3) | 69.0 (2.8) | 31.0 (2.8) | 0.0 c | 51.3 (6.7) | 32.6 (6.6) | 16.0 (0.8) | 64.9 (2.9) | 35.1 (2.9) | 0.0 |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 70.8 (7.6) | 23.8 (6.8) | 5.4 (5.1) | 78.7 (5.2) | 9.8 (3.5) | 11.4 (4.9) | 40.2 (9.4) | 39.7 (7.4) | 20.1 (8.9) | 76.0 (7.8) | 24.0 (7.8) | 0.0 |
| Sharjah | 73.9 (10.2) | 26.1 (10.2) | 0.0 c | c 82.0 (8.5) | 16.5 (8.3) | 1.5 (1.1) | 37.7 (10.8) | 53.3 (9.3) | 9.0 (6.5) | 58.2 (9.8) | 41.8 (9.8) | 0.0 |
| Umm Al Quwain | 66.3 (0.3) | 5.4 (0.3) | 28.2 (0.2) | 87.4 (0.4) | 12.6 (0.4) | $0.0 \quad \mathrm{c}$ | 63.6 (0.3) | 35.6 (0.3) | 0.8 (0.2 | 43.7 | 55.5 | 8 (0.2 |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.9 for national data.

[Part 3/4]
School transfer policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 3 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds would be transferred to another school for the following reasons: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds would be "very likely" transferred to another school because of "low academic achievement", "behavioural problems" or "special learning needs" |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Parents' or guardians' request |  |  |  |  |  | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U Australian capital territory | 69.6 | (1.0) | 25.7 | (0.9) | 4.6 | (0.5) | 84.6 | (0.8) | 14.8 | (0.8) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c |
| O New South Wales | 59.3 | (3.8) | 36.4 | (3.5) | 4.2 | (1.6) | 83.7 | (2.8) | 14.1 | (2.7) | 2.2 | (1.1) | 1.9 | (1.1) |
| Northern territory | 68.4 | (9.2) | 31.6 | (9.2) | 0.0 | c | 89.1 | (1.2) | 10.9 | (1.2) | 0.0 |  | 2.4 | (0.3) |
| Queensland | 62.9 | (4.3) | 30.2 | (4.0) | 6.9 | (2.1) | 91.0 | (2.3) | 8.1 | (2.1) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 5.1 | (2.1) |
| South Australia | 62.6 | (5.0) | 32.8 | (5.2) | 4.6 | (1.9) | 82.2 | (3.8) | 17.8 | (3.8) | 0.0 | c | 2.6 | (0.7) |
| Tasmania | 70.9 | (1.8) | 27.9 | (1.8) | 1.2 | (0.5) | 87.4 | (1.3) | 12.6 | (1.3) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
| Victoria | 55.9 | (4.3) | 36.4 | (4.1) | 7.7 | (2.4) | 80.3 | (3.3) | 18.4 | (3.2) | 1.2 | (0.9) | 2.6 | (1.3) |
| Western Australia | 61.1 | (5.0) | 35.6 | (5.2) | 3.3 | (1.8) | 80.4 | (3.7) | 16.7 | (3.3) | 2.9 | (1.7) | 3.7 | (2.4) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 54.7 | (4.1) | 38.2 | (3.7) | 7.1 | (1.8) | 77.8 | (3.9) | 17.7 | (3.8) | 4.5 | (1.8) | 30.2 | (3.7) |
| French community | 36.5 | (4.5) | 46.9 | (4.9) | 16.7 | (4.2) | 56.0 | (7.0) | 42.1 | (7.0) | 1.9 | (1.9) | 24.7 | (4.5) |
| German-speaking community | 41.7 | (0.4) | 53.8 | (0.4) | 4.5 | (0.3) | 47.4 | (0.4) | 52.6 | (0.4) | 0.0 | c | 47.0 | (0.3) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 55.1 | (5.1) | 33.0 | (4.8) | 11.9 | (3.7) | 73.4 | (6.4) | 26.6 | (6.4) | 0.0 | c | 3.6 | (1.5) |
| British Columbia | 55.2 | (5.0) | 31.3 | (5.6) | 13.5 | (4.3) | 86.6 | (6.2) | 13.4 | (6.2) | 0.0 | c | 6.3 | (2.7) |
| Manitoba | 73.5 | (2.4) | 23.8 | (2.2) | 2.8 | (1.0) | 86.3 | (5.0) | 13.7 | (5.0) | 0.0 | , | 0.0 | c |
| New Brunswick | 58.6 | (2.7) | 36.1 | (2.7) | 5.3 | (0.8) | 74.2 | (4.6) | 21.2 | (4.8) | 4.5 | (0.5) | 3.7 | (0.3) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 74.2 | (1.9) | 24.1 | (1.9) | 1.6 | (1.1) | 82.0 | (1.8) | 18.0 | (1.8) | 0.0 | c | 1.6 | (1.1) |
| Nova Scotia | 48.5 | (8.4) | 48.7 | (8.6) | 2.9 | (1.9) | 83.1 | (3.4) | 10.6 | (3.1) | 6.3 | (0.9) | 0.0 | c |
| Ontario | 69.0 | (4.7) | 29.9 | (4.6) | 1.1 | (1.0) | 74.9 | (6.6) | 22.8 | (6.5) | 2.3 | (2.1) | 1.1 | (1.0) |
| Prince Edward Island | 53.0 | (0.4) | 36.8 | (0.4) | 10.2 | (0.2) | 98.5 | (0.2) | 1.1 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.0) | 0.0 | c |
| Quebec | 53.2 | (3.7) | 39.6 | (3.5) | 7.2 | (2.0) | 72.3 | (5.0) | 26.3 | (4.9) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 12.9 | (3.0) |
| Saskatchewan | 52.1 | (3.1) | 30.9 | (2.3) | 17.0 | (1.9) | 74.0 | (3.2) | 23.5 | (3.0) | 2.4 | (1.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 13.8 | (3.6) | 58.8 | (6.6) | 27.4 | (6.5) | 31.5 | (7.4) | 68.5 | (7.4) | 0.0 | c | 19.2 | (4.2) |
| Basilicata | 11.8 | (3.9) | 75.3 | (4.4) | 12.9 | (3.9) | 49.5 | (7.8) | 48.1 | (7.9) | 2.4 | (0.2) | 6.3 | (2.4) |
| Bolzano | 29.2 | (0.6) | 45.1 | (0.8) | 25.7 | (0.9) | 44.3 | (0.8) | 51.6 | (0.8) | 4.2 | (0.3) | 38.4 | (0.7) |
| Calabria | 6.5 | (3.8) | 55.5 | (7.3) | 38.0 | (7.0) | 54.6 | (10.4) | 45.4 | (10.4) | 0.0 | c | 11.5 | (4.8) |
| Campania | 13.1 | (5.2) | 63.7 | (7.4) | 23.3 | (5.6) | 64.0 | (9.7) | 36.0 | (9.7) | 0.0 | c | 15.2 | (4.1) |
| Emilia Romagna | 23.8 | (7.5) | 56.5 | (7.7) | 19.7 | (6.8) | 65.4 | (13.2) | 34.6 | (13.2) | 0.0 | c | 21.4 | (5.1) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 18.0 | (5.4) | 68.8 | (5.2) | 13.1 | (3.3) | 53.5 | (8.2) | 40.1 | (7.5) | 6.4 | (3.6) | 9.2 | (4.4) |
| Lazio | 10.2 | (4.5) | 69.0 | (7.6) | 20.8 | (6.7) | 37.9 | (8.9) | 55.9 | (8.9) | 6.3 | (5.1) | 16.6 | (5.2) |
| Liguria | 12.0 | (4.1) | 59.5 | (6.7) | 28.5 | (6.1) | 60.2 | (11.3) | 39.5 | (11.3) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 21.2 | (5.9) |
| Lombardia | 15.3 | (5.8) | 54.6 | (8.5) | 30.1 | (7.1) | 56.1 | (9.0) | 43.9 | (9.0) | 0.0 | c | 23.3 | (6.7) |
| Marche | 14.2 | (4.3) | 66.2 | (7.5) | 19.7 | (6.3) | 62.1 | (10.7) | 31.7 | (9.5) | 6.2 | (6.0) | 12.5 | (4.9) |
| Molise | 14.1 | (0.5) | 69.0 | (0.7) | 16.9 | (0.5) | 42.2 | (1.5) | 57.8 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 6.9 | (0.3) |
| Piemonte | 10.0 | (4.3) | 66.4 | (6.8) | 23.5 | (7.0) | 65.6 | (7.5) | 28.7 | (6.7) | 5.7 | (4.1) | 10.9 | (4.6) |
| Puglia | 25.4 | (7.9) | 58.7 | (8.9) | 15.8 | (4.9) | 63.6 | (8.0) | 30.6 | (7.6) | 5.8 | (0.8) | 20.6 | (6.0) |
| Sardegna | 13.1 | (5.0) | 58.0 | (5.9) | 28.9 | (6.4) | 66.8 | (9.7) | 29.3 | (9.6) | 3.9 | (3.9) | 21.0 | (6.0) |
| Sicilia | 8.8 | (3.8) | 65.4 | (7.8) | 25.8 | (7.1) | 57.4 | (7.9) | 39.6 | (7.3) | 3.0 | (3.0) | 14.1 | (4.3) |
| Toscana | 16.0 | (6.2) | 73.2 | (7.7) | 10.9 | (4.7) | 69.8 | (10.6) | 27.7 | (10.0) | 2.6 | (2.8) | 12.1 | (5.3) |
| Trento | 16.4 | (4.7) | 69.5 | (5.4) | 14.0 | (3.1) | 62.6 | (5.7) | 37.4 | (5.7) | 0.0 | c | 16.1 | (3.8) |
| Umbria | 22.2 | (4.5) | 61.0 | (4.8) | 16.8 | (4.7) | 59.5 | (10.0) | 35.6 | (9.7) | 4.8 | (4.6) | 23.1 | (5.5) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 26.6 | (1.0) | 53.6 | (1.0) | 19.7 | (0.7) | 60.1 | (1.3) | 28.1 | (1.1) | 11.9 | (0.6) | 14.6 | (0.7) |
| Veneto | 17.4 | (6.0) | 61.5 | (8.2) | 21.2 | (6.7) | 66.1 | (10.0) | 33.9 | (10.0) | 0.0 | c | 13.4 | (5.3) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 4.6 | (2.5) | 61.8 | (5.4) | 33.5 | (5.3) | 19.0 | (5.8) | 62.8 | (7.5) | 18.2 | (4.5) | 24.9 | (4.5) |
| Baja California | 3.5 | (2.8) | 45.4 | (8.2) | 51.1 | (8.1) | 12.3 | (10.3) | 64.7 | (8.2) | 23.0 | (5.2) | 24.9 | (6.0) |
| Baja California Sur | 3.1 | (2.3) | 61.9 | (6.6) | 35.0 | (6.0) | 26.7 | (6.0) | 61.0 | (8.2) | 12.3 | (7.3) | 23.1 | (5.8) |
| Campeche | 7.6 | (2.7) | 41.3 | (7.6) | 51.1 | (7.1) | 21.9 | (5.2) | 60.7 | (8.3) | 17.4 | (7.3) | 20.8 | (8.2) |
| Chiapas | 9.3 | (4.3) | 47.4 | (9.9) | 43.4 | (9.3) | 45.8 | (10.8) | 31.9 | (9.4) | 22.3 | (10.4) | 24.3 | (7.6) |
| Chihuahua | 5.4 | (3.1) | 52.9 | (10.8) | 41.7 | (10.4) | 30.8 | (9.1) | 56.0 | (11.1) | 13.2 | (8.0) | 27.0 | (9.2) |
| Coahuila | 7.5 | (3.2) | 53.7 | (8.9) | 38.8 | (8.0) | 28.9 | (11.2) | 59.4 | (11.3) | 11.7 | (6.3) | 21.7 | (7.5) |
| Colima | 2.8 | (0.2) | 64.4 | (6.8) | 32.9 | (6.7) | 47.7 | (6.5) | 45.5 | (6.9) | 6.8 | (4.2) | 12.4 | (6.0) |
| Distrito Federal | 6.5 | (4.0) | 69.2 | (8.5) | 24.3 | (7.7) | 38.4 | (12.1) | 55.3 | (12.5) | 6.2 | (4.3) | 13.3 | (5.6) |
| Durango | 19.4 | (10.4) | 64.1 | (9.5) | 16.4 | (5.1) | 31.0 | (7.6) | 62.4 | (7.7) | 6.7 | (3.9) | 17.3 | (6.1) |
| Guanajuato | 16.0 | (6.3) | 69.8 | (7.9) | 14.2 | (6.6) | 37.6 | (8.0) | 62.4 | (8.0) | 0.0 | c | 13.9 | (6.2) |
| Guerrero | 10.2 | (4.9) | 58.4 | (8.3) | 31.4 | (9.4) | 66.7 | (13.0) | 25.5 | (10.7) | 7.8 | (7.2) | 29.6 | (8.3) |
| Hidalgo | 12.9 | (4.8) | 69.4 | (8.5) | 17.8 | (6.9) | 49.5 | (11.0) | 45.0 | (11.1) | 5.5 | (4.8) | 17.2 | (6.8) |
| Jalisco | 3.8 | (2.1) | 59.8 | (9.3) | 36.4 | (9.1) | 55.6 | (9.4) | 27.4 | (7.4) | 17.1 | (7.4) | 11.3 | (5.8) |
| Mexico | 4.3 | (2.7) | 74.8 | (5.9) | 20.9 | (6.1) | 32.0 | (9.7) | 65.5 | (9.5) | 2.4 | (2.3) | 19.2 | (7.6) |
| Morelos | 7.2 | (4.1) | 62.7 | (7.9) | 30.1 | (6.0) | 36.5 | (11.3) | 50.5 | (10.8) | 13.0 | (5.2) | 16.9 | (5.3) |
| Nayarit | 7.7 | (3.7) | 48.4 | (6.6) | 43.9 | (7.0) | 40.1 | (7.3) | 47.1 | (7.9) | 12.8 | (5.5) | 37.2 | (5.7) |
| Nuevo León | 21.6 | (8.0) | 63.3 | (9.9) | 15.1 | (7.5) | 36.4 | (9.0) | 50.5 | (9.0) | 13.1 | (8.0) | 11.5 | (4.8) |
| Puebla | 8.4 | (3.4) | 59.0 | (7.9) | 32.7 | (7.6) | 42.8 | (9.2) | 41.2 | (10.0) | 15.9 | (9.1) | 24.4 | (7.2) |
| Querétaro | 10.2 | (4.3) | 44.1 | (9.5) | 45.8 | (9.7) | 35.9 | (6.8) | 48.4 | (10.5) | 15.7 | (8.2) | 23.7 | (6.1) |
| Quintana Roo | 2.0 | (1.0) | 42.8 | (7.5) | 55.2 | (7.4) | 24.7 | (8.5) | 65.0 | (8.1) | 10.3 | (3.5) | 19.0 | (4.8) |
| San Luis Potosí | 10.7 | (4.4) | 59.7 | (9.9) | 29.6 | (9.1) | 30.4 | (8.4) | 59.1 | (11.7) | 10.5 | (7.8) | 21.8 | (7.2) |
| Sinaloa | 5.0 | (2.7) | 45.7 | (8.9) | 49.3 | (9.1) | 30.5 | (11.8) | 40.8 | (12.9) | 28.7 | (9.2) | 19.8 | (8.2) |
| Tabasco | 2.3 | (1.4) | 61.1 | (9.2) | 36.6 | (9.2) | 23.1 | (9.4) | 71.4 | (10.7) | 5.5 | (5.7) | 23.8 | (9.3) |
| Tamaulipas | 1.1 | (0.7) | 58.9 | (10.1) | 40.0 | (10.0) | 36.2 | (10.7) | 57.5 | (9.9) | 6.3 | (5.0) | 22.3 | (8.8) |
| Tlaxcala | 9.9 | (2.6) | 51.6 | (8.7) | 38.5 | (8.6) | 39.7 | (7.3) | 56.4 | (7.5) | 3.9 | (3.1) | 31.1 | (8.4) |
| Veracruz | 8.3 | (3.7) | 52.7 | (10.1) | 38.9 | (9.7) | 18.4 | (6.2) | 38.0 | (12.4) | 43.6 | (12.9) | 17.8 | (4.3) |
| Yucatán | 22.8 | (6.0) | 54.2 | (9.2) | 23.0 | (7.0) | 40.9 | (9.1) | 53.9 | (9.3) | 5.2 | (3.8) | 25.4 | (9.4) |
| Zacatecas | 8.6 | (3.6) | 40.5 | (7.5) | 50.9 | (8.1) | 23.3 | (6.7) | 38.3 | (8.4) | 38.4 | (9.7) | 30.1 | (6.3) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.9 for national data
StatLink (ainाड्य http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 4/4]
School transfer policies, by region
Table B2.IV. 3 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15 -year-olds would be transferred to another school for the following reasons: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that a student in the national modal grade for 15-year-olds would be "very likely" transferred to another school because of "low academic achievement", "behavioural problems" or "special learning needs" |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Parents' or guardians' request |  |  |  |  |  | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  | Not likely |  | Likely |  | Very likely |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 22.0 | (8.7) \| | 63.1 | (12.7) | 14.9 | (9.8) | 48.1 | (13.0) | 51.9 | (13.0) | 0.0 | c | 4.4 | (3.9) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 54.1 | (7.9) | 40.1 | (8.4) | 5.8 | (3.3) | 80.8 | (7.1) | 19.2 | (7.1) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 55.8 | (6.1) | 39.3 | (6.0) | 4.9 | (3.4) | 76.1 | (7.9) | 23.9 | (7.9) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
| Asturias* | 50.2 | (6.5) | 42.5 | (6.1) | 7.3 | (3.6) | 86.0 | (5.8) | 14.0 | (5.8) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c |
| Balearic Islands* | 52.1 | (7.1) | 37.5 | (6.7) | 10.5 | (4.7) | 82.0 | (7.2) | 18.0 | (7.2) | 0.0 | c | 2.4 | (2.4) |
| Basque Country* | 48.8 | (3.7) | 35.0 | (3.5) | 16.1 | (2.5) | 73.3 | (4.6) | 21.2 | (4.1) | 5.5 | (2.7) | 9.5 | (2.0) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 36.9 | (6.3) | 45.2 | (6.7) | 17.9 | (5.4) | 76.4 | (7.4) | 20.4 | (7.1) | 3.2 | (3.1) | 4.2 | (2.9) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 53.8 | (6.6) | 37.5 | (6.5) | 8.7 | (4.2) | 84.9 | (4.7) | 15.1 | (4.7) | 0.0 | c | 6.3 | (3.3) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 56.7 | (7.5) | 36.6 | (6.6) | 6.6 | (3.8) | 88.9 | (5.7) | 11.1 | (5.7) | 0.0 | c | 4.9 | (3.4) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 52.4 | (8.4) | 35.0 | (7.1) | 12.6 | (4.8) | 90.9 | (4.3) | 9.1 | (4.3) | 0.0 | c | 4.3 | (3.0) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 64.1 | (5.8) | 30.1 | (5.5) | 5.8 | (1.9) | 60.2 | (8.3) | 39.8 | (8.3) | 0.0 | c | 1.9 | (1.9) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 49.1 | (0.6) | 48.3 | (0.6) | 2.6 | (0.1) | 74.7 | (0.8) | 25.3 | (0.8) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 50.5 | (6.2) | 47.3 | (5.8) | 2.2 | (2.2) | 86.2 | (6.2) | 10.3 | (5.5) | 3.5 | (3.4) | 9.9 | (4.6) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 41.2 | (7.9) | 45.9 | (7.3) | 13.0 | (5.1) | 72.0 | (9.3) | 28.0 | (9.3) | 0.0 | c | 2.1 | (2.0) |
| Navarre* | 51.1 | (4.9) | 42.2 | (4.4) | 6.7 | (2.4) | 83.7 | (1.5) | 16.3 | (1.5) | 0.0 | c | 6.7 | (2.6) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 61.9 | (4.6) | 31.0 | (4.3) | 7.0 | (2.1) | 90.7 | (2.5) | 8.4 | (2.4) | 0.9 | (0.9) | 3.5 | (2.0) |
| Northern Ireland | 70.2 | (5.3) | 20.8 | (4.6) | 8.9 | (3.5) | 88.3 | (4.3) | 11.7 | (4.3) | 0.0 | 兂 | 4.9 | (2.0) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 73.6 | (4.1) | 23.7 | (4.0) | 2.7 | (1.6) | 89.7 | (3.4) | 9.3 | (3.7) | 1.0 | (1.1) | 3.3 | (1.7) |
| Wales | 61.1 | (3.7) | 32.3 | (3.8) | 6.6 | (2.2) | 90.0 | (2.9) | 8.0 | (2.5) | 2.0 | (1.4) | 2.6 | (1.3) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 73.9 | (6.4) | 19.5 | (5.9) | 6.6 | (4.1) | 90.2 | (5.3) | 7.5 | (4.7) | 2.4 | (2.6) | 0.0 | c |
| Florida* | 72.2 | (6.5) | 25.0 | (6.5) | 2.8 | (2.1) | 78.7 | (8.2) | 18.2 | (7.5) | 3.1 | (3.2) | 2.3 | (2.3) |
| Massachusetts* | 71.5 | (7.1) | 25.9 | (6.7) | 2.6 | (2.6) | 86.9 | (7.2) | 9.2 | (6.4) | 3.9 | (3.9) | 0.0 |  |
| $\sim$ Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| § Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 13.9 | (5.3) | 72.8 | (6.7) | 13.4 | (4.7) | 23.3 | (10.6) | 67.8 | (11.7) | 8.9 | (6.4) | 24.4 | (7.5) |
| - Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 0.0 | c | 24.4 | (8.7) | 75.6 | (8.7) | 20.3 | (7.2) | 56.9 | (10.9) | 22.8 | (13.3) | 19.6 | (11.2) |
| Alagoas | 5.7 | (5.9) | 65.2 | (14.2) | 29.1 | (14.1) | 26.8 | (12.7) | 54.7 | (18.4) | 18.5 | (13.4) | 13.7 | (11.8) |
| Amapá | 3.9 | (4.2) | 36.8 | (11.9) | 59.2 | (10.9) | 13.4 | (8.6) | 46.9 | (9.3) | 39.7 | (10.8) | 4.3 | (3.4) |
| Amazonas | 0.0 | c | 38.5 | (13.2) | 61.5 | (13.2) | 18.6 | (8.3) | 62.5 | (7.1) | 18.9 | (10.6) | 28.7 | (9.8) |
| Bahia | 7.8 | (7.1) | 54.0 | (10.4) | 38.2 | (14.3) | 19.5 | (15.1) | 57.6 | (18.1) | 22.9 | (10.4) | 9.8 | (10.7) |
| Ceará | 11.1 | (6.3) | 16.6 | (9.1) | 72.3 | (9.0) | 24.6 | (12.4) | 38.0 | (9.1) | 37.4 | (14.7) | 8.0 | (7.4) |
| Espírito Santo | 4.8 | (6.8) | 37.3 | (11.8) | 57.9 | (9.0) | 28.0 | (5.6) | 50.6 | (16.8) | 21.4 | (15.3) | 17.6 | (9.8) |
| Federal District | 5.3 | (5.2) | 33.5 | (9.1) | 61.2 | (9.9) | 22.4 | (14.1) | 50.0 | (13.0) | 27.6 | (10.9) | 35.0 | (14.1) |
| Goiás | 15.7 | (7.6) | 56.2 | (12.2) | 28.1 | (10.3) | 30.1 | (10.9) | 57.2 | (12.6) | 12.8 | (8.2) | 28.7 | (11.3) |
| Maranhão | 8.7 | (6.7) | 55.6 | (16.5) | 35.7 | (14.2) |  | (11.8) | 68.6 | (14.4) | 12.4 | (9.4) | 15.9 | (10.5) |
| Mato Grosso | 5.1 | (4.9) | 54.9 | (8.7) | 40.0 | (8.4) | 40.3 | (11.9) | 34.0 | (12.9) | 25.7 | (12.1) | 29.5 | (9.9) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 5.5 | (3.6) | 62.2 | (9.6) | 32.3 | (9.6) | 24.0 | (10.6) | 39.3 | (12.0) | 36.6 | (11.7) | 21.0 | (3.9) |
| Minas Gerais | 16.6 | (8.2) | 46.2 | (9.2) | 37.2 | (9.8) | 27.3 | (8.1) | 62.5 | (7.8) | 10.2 | (2.6) | 14.0 | (6.9) |
| Pará | 20.8 | (12.2) | 25.6 | (8.1) | 53.6 | (11.8) | 18.5 | (9.9) | 67.5 | (15.3) | 14.0 | (15.5) | 4.4 | (3.7) |
| Paraíba | 9.6 | (8.4) | 58.8 | (13.2) | 31.7 | (15.4) | 41.4 | (11.9) | 46.0 | (12.8) | 12.6 | (6.3) | 24.9 | (15.6) |
| Paraná | 16.0 | (8.2) | 34.1 | (11.4) | 49.8 | (9.6) | 29.1 | (11.8) | 40.0 | (12.6) | 30.9 | (10.6) | 0.0 | c |
| Pernambuco | 8.4 | (7.0) | 57.9 | (15.5) | 33.7 | (13.6) | 37.2 | (14.8) | 29.9 | (13.5) | 32.9 | (15.8) | 18.9 | (7.8) |
| Piauí | 19.3 | (9.2) | 67.2 | (12.9) | 13.5 | (8.3) | 31.0 | (13.7) | 33.1 | (12.6) | 35.9 | (14.1) | 27.9 | (10.4) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 35.9 | (9.0) | 34.8 | (10.1) | 29.3 | (9.1) | 31.3 | (11.1) | 41.9 | (13.4) | 26.7 | (11.0) | 29.8 | (11.4) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 18.5 | (10.3) | 39.6 | (13.5) | 41.9 | (13.7) | 6.2 | (5.8) | 75.4 | (11.8) | 18.4 | (10.3) | 24.4 | (11.8) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 17.0 | (6.3) | 58.8 | (9.8) | 24.2 | (10.8) | 20.9 | (8.3) | 57.1 | (15.0) | 22.0 | (12.6) | 10.8 | (5.5) |
| Rondônia | 6.2 | (5.2) | 37.6 | (10.1) | 56.2 | (9.8) | 12.1 | (4.4) | 39.6 | (11.5) | 48.3 | (11.6) | 0.0 |  |
| Roraima | 0.0 | c | 50.8 | (9.4) | 49.2 | (9.4) | 16.4 | (9.1) | 55.0 | (13.5) | 28.6 | (10.3) | 17.6 | (10.0) |
| Santa Catarina | 0.0 | c | 43.7 | (14.2) | 56.3 | (14.2) | 51.1 | (12.7) | 19.1 | (8.6) | 29.8 | (13.1) | 27.1 | (11.7) |
| São Paulo | 8.1 | (3.7) | 50.0 | (7.9) | 41.9 | (7.3) | 20.5 | (5.1) | 52.3 | (6.6) | 27.2 | (6.2) | 9.2 | (3.9) |
| Sergipe | 11.7 | (8.5) | 36.5 | (8.3) | 51.8 | (11.2) | 32.4 | (16.5) | 47.6 | (14.8) | 20.0 | (12.5) | 35.1 | (14.8) |
| Tocantins | 3.3 | (3.3) | 54.1 | (11.9) | 42.5 | (11.3) | 50.4 | (13.3) | 33.6 | (10.9) | 15.9 | (8.3) | 24.9 | (9.5) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 3.0 | (2.2) | 58.5 | (7.0) | 38.4 | (6.7) | 19.3 | (5.7) | 62.2 | (7.5) | 18.5 | (7.5) | 11.8 | (5.0) |
| Cali | 3.8 | (2.6) | 72.7 | (7.3) | 23.5 | (7.3) | 10.9 | (4.5) | 65.8 | (8.4) | 23.2 | (7.7) | 16.8 | (6.1) |
| Manizales | 7.3 | (2.6) | 64.3 | (6.9) | 28.4 | (6.2) | 6.3 | (3.4) | 61.0 | (10.5) | 32.7 | (10.8) | 19.6 | (5.4) |
| Medellin | 4.8 | (3.1) | 62.9 | (6.9) | 32.3 | (6.3) | 14.0 | (4.8) | 68.3 | (7.7) | 17.7 | (6.1) | 9.3 | (3.2) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 38.9 | (7.1) | 40.0 | (7.0) | 21.1 | (5.8) | 44.9 | (7.7) | 49.1 | (8.0) | 6.0 | (3.2) | 9.3 | (3.9) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 7.6 | (1.9) | 57.1 | (4.5) | 35.3 | (4.0) | 27.6 | (3.5) | 60.0 | (4.6) | 12.4 | (3.7) | 16.6 | (3.3) |
| Ajman | 0.0 |  | 59.2 | (9.6) | 40.8 | (9.6) | 3.3 | (3.1) | 57.1 | (7.5) | 39.6 | (8.2) | 21.3 | (6.2) |
| Dubai• | 30.4 | (0.2) | 45.8 | (0.2) | 23.8 | (0.2) | 40.9 | (0.3) | 49.8 | (0.3) | 9.3 | (0.1) | 17.0 | (0.1) |
| Fujairah | 4.6 | (3.5) | 55.6 | (6.4) | 39.8 | (7.9) | 19.3 | (3.8) | 54.8 | (7.3) | 25.9 | (8.6) | 21.6 | (1.0) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 3.0 | (0.3) | 62.0 | (5.4) | 35.0 | (5.4) | 3.6 | (3.7) | 74.5 | (10.4) | 21.9 | (9.7) | 20.1 | (8.9) |
| Sharjah | 11.0 | (3.8) | 60.2 | (12.3) | 28.8 | (11.7) | 23.4 | (6.2) | 63.5 | (10.7) | 13.1 | (8.8) | 9.0 | (6.5) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 29.5 | (0.2) | 19.4 | (0.3) | 51.1 | (0.2) | 40.1 | (0.2) | 33.1 | (0.4) | 26.9 | (0.3) | 29.0 | (0.1) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.9 for national data.
StatLink 唡ist http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 1/4]
Ability grouping for mathematics classes, by region
Table B2.IV. 4 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Mathematics classes study similar content, but at different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | age o | tudent | in sch | ools w | se pr | cipal r | ported: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Different classes study different content or sets of mathematics topics that have different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | Students are grouped by ability within their mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { For } \\ & \text { all classes } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { For } \\ \text { some classes } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Not for any class |  | Forall classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any class |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { For } \\ & \text { all classes } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { For } \\ \text { some classes } \end{array}$ |  | Not for any class |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 67.2 | (0.9) | 29.2 | (0.9) | 3.6 | (0.3) | 24.8 | (0.7) | 61.4 | (0.9) | 13.7 | (0.6) | 55.3 | (1.1) | 39.3 | (1.1) | 5.4 | (0.5) |
| O New South Wales | 44.2 | (3.9) | 49.6 | (4.0) | 6.2 | (1.7) | 35.4 | (3.4) | 53.8 | (3.6) | 10.8 | (2.2) | 63.2 | (3.2) | 31.2 | (3.2) | 5.7 | (1.2) |
| Northern territory | 43.3 | (4.3) | 55.6 | (4.3) | 1.1 | (1.1) | 31.2 | (3.0) | 44.2 | (4.7) | 24.6 | (2.9) | 72.9 | (2.8) | 25.1 | (2.5) | 2.0 | (1.3) |
| Queensland | 40.5 | (4.5) | 58.0 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (1.0) | 15.0 | (3.0) | 62.4 | (4.0) | 22.6 | (3.5) | 27.2 | (4.6) | 62.5 | (4.9) | 10.3 | (2.6) |
| South Australia | 28.7 | (4.7) | 66.5 | (5.1) | 4.8 | (2.3) | 16.5 | (3.0) | 71.5 | (4.2) | 12.1 | (3.5) | 33.9 | (4.4) | 49.4 | (4.8) | 16.7 | (4.2) |
| Tasmania | 46.2 | (1.5) | 49.3 | (1.6) | 4.5 | (1.6) | 25.2 | (1.9) | 65.4 | (1.9) | 9.3 | (0.8) | 46.8 | (1.6) | 44.1 | (1.2) | 9.2 | (1.1) |
| Victoria | 29.3 | (4.1) | 62.4 | (4.3) | 8.3 | (2.5) | 21.1 | (3.7) | 64.6 | (4.3) | 14.3 | (3.0) | 24.5 | (3.4) | 56.2 | (4.0) | 19.3 | (3.2) |
| Western Australia | 29.8 | (5.0) | 58.3 | (5.7) | 11.9 | (4.1) | 39.8 | (5.3) | 56.8 | (5.5) | 3.4 | (2.3) | 61.8 | (5.5) | 31.5 | (5.2) | 6.7 | (2.3) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 9.1 | (2.5) | 66.8 | (4.0) | 24.1 | (3.7) | 18.5 | (3.2) | 66.7 | (4.2) | 14.8 | (3.0) | 2.8 | (1.1) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 73.1 | (3.5) |
| French community | 16.5 | (4.1) | 40.7 | (5.6) | 42.8 | (6.0) | 8.0 | (2.5) | 42.2 | (5.8) | 49.8 | (5.8) | 5.3 | (1.9) | 10.8 | (3.4) | 83.9 | (3.8) |
| German-speaking community | 0.0 | . | 43.1 | (0.4) | 56.9 | (0.4) | 33.3 | (0.2) | 66.7 | (0.2) | 0.0 | c | 1.3 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 98.7 | (0.3) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 28.1 | (4.2) | 62.8 | (4.6) | 9.1 | (3.0) | 41.4 | (3.7) | 51.9 | (4.4) | 6.8 | (3.2) | 28.5 | (4.7) | 48.8 | (5.3) | 22.6 | (4.5) |
| British Columbia | 13.8 | (4.4) | 61.1 | (5.3) | 25.1 | (4.8) | 27.2 | (5.1) | 46.5 | (5.6) | 26.3 | (3.8) | 13.2 | (3.5) | 46.5 | (5.2) | 40.3 | (4.6) |
| Manitoba | 30.1 | (3.2) | 50.7 | (3.5) | 19.2 | (2.4) | 32.0 | (3.1) | 45.8 | (3.3) | 22.2 | (3.6) | 5.2 | (1.6) | 50.3 | (3.4) | 44.5 | (3.0) |
| New Brunswick | 30.5 | (3.0) | 53.6 | (2.5) | 15.8 | (1.2) | 5.9 | (1.5) | 45.1 | (2.5) | 49.1 | (2.5) | 3.0 | (0.2) | 59.3 | (2.9) | 37.6 | (3.0) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 10.0 | (1.5) | 59.7 | (5.1) | 30.2 | (5.4) | 16.3 | (3.8) | 64.2 | (2.8) | 19.5 | (5.7) | 16.7 | (1.3) | 21.3 | (3.4) | 62.0 | (3.5) |
| Nova Scotia | 8.8 | (2.6) | 84.5 | (3.9) | 6.7 | (2.7) | 22.2 | (4.7) | 69.2 | (6.1) | 8.6 | (3.1) | 15.7 | (4.1) | 56.1 | (7.5) | 28.2 | (5.8) |
| Ontario | 31.9 | (5.7) | 57.5 | (5.4) | 10.6 | (2.8) | 34.2 | (5.2) | 47.8 | (5.5) | 18.0 | (4.3) | 21.4 | (3.8) | 46.6 | (5.0) | 32.0 | (4.8) |
| Prince Edward Island | 26.0 | (0.4) | 55.7 | (0.5) | 18.3 | (0.3) | 13.2 | (0.2) | 84.0 | (0.3) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 38.6 | (0.4) | 19.6 | (0.3) | 41.8 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 17.2 | (3.0) | 48.7 | (4.5) | 34.2 | (4.6) | 26.4 | (4.0) | 49.2 | (4.0) | 24.4 | (3.2) | 23.8 | (3.5) | 32.8 | (3.3) | 43.4 | (4.6) |
| Saskatchewan | 13.9 | (2.6) | 75.4 | (3.3) | 10.6 | (2.0) | 17.3 | (1.2) | 57.6 | (4.2) | 25.1 | (4.1) | 5.0 | (2.1) | 58.6 | (3.4) | 36.4 | (3.5) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 16.6 | (5.3) | 54.6 | (6.4) | 28.7 | (6.5) | 12.0 | (5.0) | 54.8 | (6.9) | 33.2 | (6.5) | 0.0 | (0.0) | 32.7 | (4.9) | 67.3 | (4.9) |
| Basilicata | 16.5 | (3.4) | 51.9 | (5.0) | 31.6 | (5.2) | 7.9 | (2.2) | 47.7 | (6.3) | 44.4 | (6.1) | 6.8 | (2.7) | 25.1 | (6.5) | 68.1 | (6.6) |
| Bolzano | 12.3 | (0.5) | 41.3 | (0.8) | 46.3 | (0.8) | 7.6 | (0.3) | 44.4 | (0.8) | 48.0 | (0.9) | 2.4 | (0.1) | 45.2 | (0.9) | 52.4 | (0.9) |
| Calabria | 19.4 | (6.2) | 50.9 | (7.8) | 29.6 | (6.5) | 2.9 | (2.1) | 59.7 | (8.2) | 37.4 | (8.3) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 41.1 | (7.1) | 58.4 | (7.0) |
| Campania | 36.1 | (8.3) | 46.7 | (7.9) | 17.2 | (5.3) | 18.6 | (8.9) | 45.8 | (7.7) | 35.6 | (8.0) | 4.2 | (2.6) | 25.0 | (5.2) | 70.8 | (5.8) |
| Emilia Romagna | 31.0 | (6.0) | 35.2 | (7.9) | 33.9 | (7.6) | 7.6 | (3.9) | 45.0 | (6.7) | 47.4 | (7.3) | 0.0 | c | 38.3 | (7.0) | 61.7 | (7.0) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 16.0 | (3.1) | 62.1 | (5.6) | 21.9 | (5.0) | 1.9 | (1.6) | 72.0 | (3.8) | 26.1 | (3.5) | 0.3 | (0.3) | 54.0 | (5.4) | 45.7 | (5.4) |
| Lazio | 23.7 | (8.1) | 38.1 | (8.8) | 38.2 | (7.9) | 11.8 | (6.9) | 41.8 | (8.8) | 46.4 | (8.0) | 4.7 | (3.3) | 33.6 | (8.8) | 61.7 | (8.5) |
| Liguria | 28.1 | (6.8) | 40.7 | (7.0) | 31.2 | (7.6) | 19.1 | (5.5) | 44.9 | (7.1) | 36.0 | (6.8) | 9.5 | (5.2) | 30.0 | (6.8) | 60.5 | (7.2) |
| Lombardia | 22.3 | (5.9) | 39.6 | (9.0) | 38.2 | (8.0) | 3.5 | (3.0) | 57.1 | (8.0) | 39.4 | (7.7) | 0.0 | c | 27.0 | (6.6) | 73.0 | (6.6) |
| Marche | 10.6 | (4.9) | 54.0 | (6.2) | 35.4 | (5.8) | 5.5 | (3.6) | 50.2 | (7.5) | 44.3 | (6.6) | 0.0 | c | 18.4 | (5.2) | 81.6 | (5.2) |
| Molise | 11.5 | (0.6) | 55.1 | (0.8) | 33.4 | (0.8) | 12.1 | (0.7) | 55.5 | (0.8) | 32.5 | (0.8) | 4.8 | (0.4) | 33.7 | (1.0) | 61.5 | (1.0) |
| Piemonte | 20.5 | (4.8) | 53.0 | (7.4) | 26.4 | (6.8) | 15.4 | (5.7) | 49.1 | (7.9) | 35.6 | (6.1) | 2.5 | (2.4) | 29.5 | (7.1) | 68.0 | (7.5) |
| Puglia | 16.7 | (4.7) | 49.0 | (6.8) | 34.2 | (6.7) | 8.0 | (4.0) | 39.2 | (7.4) | 52.8 | (7.8) | 6.3 | (1.9) | 30.0 | (8.2) | 63.6 | (8.6) |
| Sardegna | 9.9 | (4.5) | 59.3 | (5.9) | 30.8 | (7.0) | 8.0 | (4.2) | 44.3 | (6.9) | 47.7 | (7.9) | 2.3 | (2.2) | 30.5 | (7.0) | 67.3 | (7.2) |
| Sicilia | 30.9 | (6.3) | 40.8 | (6.9) | 28.4 | (6.4) | 7.6 | (3.5) | 53.3 | (7.1) | 39.1 | (6.9) | 4.0 | (2.7) | 26.0 | (6.8) | 69.9 | (7.3) |
| Toscana | 20.6 | (7.0) | 49.3 | (7.5) | 30.0 | (8.0) | 0.0 | c | 50.6 | (7.8) | 49.4 | (7.8) | 0.0 | c | 25.6 | (6.3) | 74.4 | (6.3) |
| Trento | 22.1 | (4.1) | 51.5 | (3.5) | 26.4 | (3.9) | 18.5 | (2.7) | 52.6 | (5.2) | 28.9 | (5.0) | 1.7 | (1.2) | 34.0 | (4.8) | 64.4 | (4.7) |
| Umbria | 17.2 | (4.2) | 56.7 | (5.4) | 26.1 | (4.9) | 6.6 | (4.6) | 48.2 | (4.8) | 45.2 | (5.8) | 0.0 | c | 18.7 | (3.6) | 81.3 | (3.6) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 1.7 | (0.1) | 28.6 | (1.0) | 69.7 | (1.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 28.8 | (0.8) | 70.2 | (0.8) | 0.9 | (0.2) | 41.4 | (1.0) | 57.6 | (1.0) |
| Veneto | 19.4 | (5.2) | 53.5 | (6.4) | 27.1 | (5.7) | 7.2 | (3.6) | 63.1 | (6.0) | 29.7 | (6.0) | 2.8 | (2.7) | 22.2 | (6.0) | 75.1 | (5.6) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 36.7 | (5.2) | 31.0 | (7.6) | 32.3 | (7.3) | 19.1 | (5.0) | 18.6 | (7.1) | 62.4 | (8.5) | 10.5 | (4.7) | 39.4 | (6.0) | 50.1 | (6.8) |
| Baja California | 24.8 | (6.3) | 35.9 | (8.9) | 39.3 | (7.7) | 20.0 | (5.3) | 35.3 | (10.0) | 44.6 | (9.7) | 25.4 | (8.5) | 46.6 | (14.9) | 28.0 | (10.1) |
| Baja California Sur | 29.3 | (6.8) | 41.9 | (7.9) | 28.8 | (6.1) | 16.8 | (5.5) | 32.1 | (8.5) | 51.1 | (8.2) | 13.6 | (8.0) | 42.7 | (6.4) | 43.7 | (6.0) |
| Campeche | 45.4 | (6.4) | 18.5 | (7.5) | 36.1 | (8.1) | 26.4 | (6.3) | 27.7 | (7.5) | 46.0 | (8.6) | 24.4 | (7.3) | 49.9 | (6.8) | 25.7 | (7.1) |
| Chiapas | 41.0 | (8.2) | 39.0 | (8.1) | 20.0 | (6.2) | 43.0 | (7.3) | 24.6 | (5.8) | 32.3 | (7.0) | 32.5 | (8.3) | 36.4 | (8.9) | 31.1 | (7.1) |
| Chihuahua | 40.7 | (8.1) | 40.5 | (8.8) | 18.9 | (5.0) | 17.7 | (6.7) | 34.5 | (11.5) | 47.8 | (8.9) | 24.2 | (4.9) | 40.8 | (8.8) | 35.0 | (9.3) |
| Coahuila | 37.3 | (8.7) | 25.9 | (7.9) | 36.8 | (9.4) | 21.2 | (7.7) | 22.8 | (7.7) | 56.0 | (10.0) | 8.7 | (3.9) | 40.9 | (10.1) | 50.4 | (9.7) |
| Colima | 27.4 | (3.7) | 28.8 | (5.4) | 43.8 | (5.0) | 14.2 | (4.5) | 20.1 | (6.3) | 65.7 | (4.8) | 14.6 | (4.3) | 45.0 | (7.9) | 40.3 | (7.4) |
| Distrito Federal | 38.8 | (7.4) | 37.3 | (8.9) | 23.8 | (6.4) | 20.5 | (7.6) | 36.8 | (10.5) | 42.7 | (9.4) | 17.8 | (5.6) | 40.2 | (8.6) | 42.0 | (7.4) |
| Durango | 54.4 | (9.0) | 20.8 | (7.5) | 24.9 | (6.7) | 23.7 | (6.5) | 28.6 | (8.1) | 47.7 | (8.8) | 22.2 | (6.3) | 47.7 | (9.2) | 30.1 | (7.2) |
| Guanajuato | 40.4 | (8.2) | 17.2 | (6.2) | 42.4 | (8.9) | 28.1 | (7.2) | 18.9 | (6.0) | 53.0 | (8.7) | 21.0 | (7.2) | 35.4 | (7.1) | 43.6 | (5.4) |
| Guerrero | 31.1 | (8.1) | 37.5 | (8.6) | 31.4 | (9.2) | 26.1 | (8.1) | 40.4 | (8.8) | 33.5 | (9.0) | 26.2 | (7.6) | 37.8 | (10.3) | 36.0 | (9.4) |
| Hidalgo | 36.6 | (8.4) | 35.8 | (7.4) | 27.5 | (5.9) | 23.4 | (6.8) | 19.4 | (6.8) | 57.2 | (7.9) | 13.4 | (4.7) | 48.5 | (7.6) | 38.1 | (7.1) |
| Jalisco | 25.2 | (5.4) | 42.1 | (10.5) | 32.6 | (9.2) | 13.5 | (4.9) | 34.5 | (10.2) | 51.9 | (9.3) | 19.1 | (9.1) | 38.2 | (9.9) | 42.7 | (9.5) |
| Mexico | 30.2 | (6.6) | 38.4 | (7.1) | 31.4 | (6.5) | 20.2 | (6.8) | 29.8 | (8.1) | 50.0 | (7.4) | 23.3 | (9.2) | 29.7 | (6.3) | 47.0 | (9.0) |
| Morelos | 23.7 | (7.0) | 33.1 | (9.0) | 43.2 | (8.4) | 23.9 | (8.2) | 34.3 | (8.1) | 41.7 | (9.7) | 6.7 | (2.6) | 64.8 | (6.4) | 28.5 | (6.4) |
| Nayarit | 40.0 | (7.4) | 28.0 | (5.7) | 32.0 | (6.0) | 16.2 | (4.7) | 26.9 | (6.3) | 57.0 | (5.9) | 18.1 | (5.7) | 28.1 | (6.4) | 53.8 | (7.1) |
| Nuevo León | 46.0 | (6.6) | 22.8 | (7.1) | 31.2 | (7.0) | 33.6 | (7.6) | 13.9 | (4.1) | 52.6 | (6.9) | 23.1 | (7.8) | 29.3 | (7.0) | 47.7 | (8.3) |
| Puebla | 26.9 | (7.6) | 50.0 | (7.4) | 23.1 | (5.1) | 28.7 | (7.6) | 43.7 | (10.0) | 27.7 | (7.7) | 18.0 | (5.5) | 43.0 | (7.4) | 39.0 | (7.2) |
| Querétaro | 19.2 | (7.4) | 34.5 | (10.2) | 46.3 | (12.6) | 24.7 | (6.1) | 16.1 | (7.7) | 59.2 | (10.5) | 7.0 | (3.1) | 46.0 | (9.8) | 47.0 | (9.8) |
| Quintana Roo | 37.4 | (5.7) | 36.7 | (4.4) | 25.9 | (6.6) | 38.2 | (9.5) | 17.5 | (6.3) | 44.3 | (10.7) | 8.0 | (4.2) | 40.8 | (9.7) | 51.1 | (8.8) |
| San Luis Potosí | 33.7 | (5.5) | 37.3 | (6.6) | 29.0 | (6.4) | 28.9 | (6.4) | 22.8 | (9.0) | 48.3 | (10.0) | 18.4 | (5.3) | 37.1 | (5.9) | 44.5 | (6.2) |
| Sinaloa | 40.7 | (9.3) | 35.4 | (9.9) | 24.0 | (8.0) | 23.1 | (8.8) | 23.2 | (8.0) | 53.8 | (9.5) | 19.7 | (8.2) | 55.8 | (8.2) | 24.5 | (5.6) |
| Tabasco | 46.0 | (9.4) | 29.0 | (7.1) | 25.1 | (8.1) | 20.9 | (7.0) | 25.4 | (8.0) | 53.7 | (8.6) | 13.7 | (7.4) | 42.7 | (9.4) | 43.6 | (9.8) |
| Tamaulipas | 38.5 | (9.5) | 30.3 | (10.7) | 31.2 | (7.6) | 20.6 | (7.7) | 22.8 | (10.3) | 56.7 | (7.1) | 17.8 | (7.5) | 33.7 | (9.9) | 48.5 | (8.3) |
| Tlaxcala | 43.1 | (9.2) | 31.8 | (8.0) | 25.1 | (5.7) | 27.4 | (5.8) | 21.2 | (7.2) | 51.4 | (6.7) | 19.3 | (7.2) | 45.6 | (8.0) | 35.1 | (8.0) |
| Veracruz | 31.8 | (7.1) | 36.6 | (8.1) | 31.6 | (6.7) | 24.1 | (7.0) | 26.1 | (6.3) | 49.9 | (7.1) | 10.8 | (4.2) | 43.3 | (9.4) | 46.0 | (9.7) |
| Yucatán | 39.5 | (9.8) | 23.9 | (8.3) | 36.6 | (9.3) | 20.8 | (7.3) | 25.3 | (8.3) | 53.9 | (7.8) | 12.1 | (5.8) | 48.3 | (8.5) | 39.6 | (8.3) |
| Zacatecas | 43.2 | (7.9) | 33.0 | (7.6) | 23.8 | (6.4) | 26.8 | (6.0) | 28.6 | (6.7) | 44.6 | (6.8) | 19.2 | (5.2) | 47.7 | (7.3) | 33.2 | (4.7) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.11 for national data.
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[Part 2/4]
Ability grouping for mathematics classes, by region
Table B2.IV. 4 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics classes study similar content, but at different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | Different classes study different content or sets of mathematics topics that have different levels of difficulty |  |  |  |  |  | Students are grouped by ability within their mathematics classes |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Forall classes |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { For } \\ \text { some classes } \end{gathered}$ |  | Notfor any class |  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any class |  | Forall classes |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { For } \\ \text { some classes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Not for any class |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 9.9 | (6.3) | 37.0 | (9.5) | 53.1 | (9.3) | 0.0 | c | 33.8 | (10.3) | 66.2 | (10.3) | 0.0 | c | 20.9 | (8.7) | 79.1 | (8.7) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 45.3 | (7.8) | 40.1 | (7.4) | 14.6 | (5.4) | 24.1 | (5.5) | 47.2 | (6.4) | 28.7 | (5.8) | 7.0 | (3.5) | 18.2 | (6.1) | 74.9 | (7.1) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.1 | (5.0) | 49.3 | (6.9) | 19.6 | (6.5) | 21.5 | (5.1) | 41.7 | (7.9) | 36.8 | (7.7) | 1.8 | (1.8) | 19.8 | (5.9) | 78.4 | (5.5) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 41.9 | (6.9) | 52.4 | (7.1) | 5.6 | (1.7) | 27.5 | (7.4) | 41.6 | (7.7) | 30.9 | (6.9) | 3.5 | (2.4) | 25.0 | (6.1) | 71.6 | (5.5) |
| Balearic Islands* | 41.1 | (7.8) | 48.6 | (7.0) | 10.3 | (4.6) | 18.0 | (5.2) | 40.7 | (6.9) | 41.3 | (5.5) | 11.2 | (4.6) | 22.8 | (6.2) | 66.0 | (7.6) |
| Basque Country* | 19.9 | (2.8) | 51.9 | (4.2) | 28.2 | (3.4) | 3.8 | (1.3) | 38.3 | (3.7) | 57.9 | (3.8) | 4.7 | (1.6) | 17.6 | (3.1) | 77.7 | (3.5) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 35.4 | (6.6) | 54.8 | (6.9) | 9.8 | (4.5) | 11.3 | (4.6) | 37.7 | (5.8) | 51.0 | (5.9) | 1.7 | (1.7) | 20.1 | (5.5) | 78.2 | (5.2) |
| Castile and Leon* | 33.1 | (7.1) | 41.8 | (5.1) | 25.0 | (6.9) | 25.2 | (5.2) | 39.8 | (5.9) | 35.0 | (6.2) | 5.0 | (2.9) | 12.5 | (4.9) | 82.5 | (5.7) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 38.0 | (7.0) | 52.9 | (7.7) | 9.1 | (4.2) | 12.0 | (4.7) | 48.8 | (7.3) | 39.2 | (7.6) | 26.6 | (6.2) | 35.0 | (7.1) | 38.4 | (5.7) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.0 | (5.7) | 45.6 | (7.3) | 23.4 | (6.3) | 29.8 | (6.0) | 43.4 | (6.5) | 26.8 | (6.2) | 1.9 | (1.9) | 5.7 | (3.3) | 92.4 | (3.8) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.4 | (6.1) | 39.0 | (7.5) | 29.6 | (6.0) | 16.7 | (4.8) | 31.0 | (7.2) | 52.3 | (7.1) | 7.3 | (3.6) | 9.5 | (4.0) | 83.3 | (5.4) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 36.7 | (0.5) | 48.3 | (0.5) | 14.9 | (0.4) | 28.3 | (0.4) | 35.6 | (0.5) | 36.1 | (0.5) | 13.1 | (0.3) | 11.0 | (0.3) | 75.9 | (0.4) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 37.1 | (7.1) | 46.7 | (7.4) | 16.2 | (6.0) | 16.2 | (6.2) | 48.5 | (8.4) | 35.3 | (7.2) | 3.1 | (2.3) | 23.1 | (5.2) | 73.8 | (5.7) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 28.8 | (6.7) | 57.2 | (8.3) | 14.0 | (5.6) | 23.2 | (7.2) | 50.6 | (7.8) | 26.2 | (6.1) | 4.0 | (2.8) | 24.5 | (6.3) | 71.5 | (6.3) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 37.4 | (5.2) | 48.4 | (7.0) | 14.2 | (4.7) | 15.3 | (5.4) | 65.0 | (5.5) | 19.6 | (4.5) | 5.2 | (3.0) | 29.7 | (4.7) | 65.1 | (5.5) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 50.6 | (4.3) | 47.3 | (4.5) | 2.2 | (1.2) | 28.5 | (3.7) | 52.0 | (4.3) | 19.5 | (3.6) | 79.1 | (3.0) | 16.0 | (2.8) | 4.9 | (1.6) |
| Northern Ireland | 52.2 | (5.0) | 41.1 | (4.6) | 6.8 | (2.9) | 15.8 | (3.6) | 67.8 | (4.6) | 16.4 | (4.2) | 59.5 | (5.0) | 29.1 | (5.0) | 11.4 | (3.3) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 32.8 | (4.8) | 59.1 | (5.1) | 8.1 | (2.6) | 35.7 | (4.8) | 54.0 | (4.9) | 10.3 | (2.4) | 62.3 | (4.9) | 24.1 | (4.4) | 13.6 | (3.5) |
| Wales | 53.2 | (4.1) | 44.6 | (4.1) | 2.2 | (1.3) | 26.9 | (3.5) | 50.9 | (3.8) | 22.2 | (3.2) | 74.4 | (3.5) | 15.8 | (3.1) | 9.8 | (2.5) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut ${ }^{*}$ | 30.0 | (6.8) | 67.4 | (7.0) | 2.6 | (2.5) | 29.5 | (7.1) | 56.4 | (8.4) | 14.1 | (5.6) | 32.5 | (7.0) | 44.2 | (6.9) | 23.3 | (6.1) |
| Florida ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 12.6 | (4.7) | 82.6 | (5.4) | 4.8 | (2.7) | 26.1 | (6.4) | 61.9 | (7.6) | 12.0 | (4.7) | 25.5 | (6.2) | 65.1 | (6.2) | 9.4 | (4.2) |
| Massachusetts* | 37.2 | (7.8) | 60.5 | (8.1) | 2.3 | (2.6) | 17.8 | (6.1) | 69.7 | (6.4) | 12.6 | (5.1) | 35.9 | (7.5) | 44.7 | (7.8) | 19.4 | (5.6) |


|  | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ® | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 23.6 | (6.6) | 47.5 | (8.0) | 28.9 | (8.1) | 8.1 | (3.8) | 39.8 | (8.1) | 52.1 | (8.7) | 7.4 | (4.3) | 7.6 | (3.9) | 85.1 | (5.7) |
| む | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acre | 67.1 | (7.5) | 22.9 | (8.0) | 10.1 | (6.9) | 35.5 | (12.8) | 25.8 | (7.2) | 38.7 | (11.0) | 1.9 | (2.0) | 9.8 | (7.3) | 88.4 | (7.8) |
|  | Alagoas | 34.0 | (13.5) | 55.7 | (14.7) | 10.2 | (9.7) | 4.8 | (5.1) | 61.7 | (12.9) | 33.5 | (14.4) | 12.5 | (8.8) | 13.9 | (9.4) | 73.7 | (6.9) |
|  | Amapá | 49.7 | (9.1) | 39.1 | (8.5) | 11.2 | (6.6) | 9.1 | (6.4) | 25.8 | (10.2) | 65.1 | (11.6) | 5.2 | (5.1) | 6.9 | (1.4) | 87.9 | (5.2) |
|  | Amazonas | 44.0 | (14.3) | 30.6 | (11.1) | 25.4 | (12.1) | 14.0 | (9.4) | 18.9 | (10.2) | 67.1 | (10.4) | 0.0 | c | 12.7 | (8.2) | 87.3 | (8.2) |
|  | Bahia | 49.3 | (18.6) | 30.8 | (12.8) | 19.9 | (14.3) | 7.3 | (6.7) | 27.9 | (12.4) | 64.8 | (12.5) | 7.3 | (6.7) | 16.0 | (10.8) | 76.7 | (11.8) |
|  | Ceará | 28.2 | (10.7) | 34.6 | (11.2) | 37.2 | (9.2) | 3.4 | (3.8) | 30.7 | (9.3) | 65.9 | (10.1) | 0.0 | c | 16.3 | (10.9) | 83.7 | (10.9) |
|  | Espírito Santo | 48.1 | (18.7) | 34.4 | (9.6) | 17.5 | (12.6) | 11.6 | (6.6) | 26.5 | (10.3) | 62.0 | (9.9) | 0.0 | c | 3.7 | (3.3) | 96.3 | (3.3) |
|  | Federal District | 43.1 | (17.1) | 21.2 | (10.4) | 35.7 | (14.9) | 4.3 | (4.5) | 12.9 | (9.2) | 82.8 | (6.9) | 4.3 | (4.5) | 18.7 | (13.5) | 77.0 | (12.2) |
|  | Goiás | 45.2 | (8.1) | 41.9 | (10.0) | 12.9 | (7.2) | 32.9 | (10.0) | 38.8 | (10.3) | 28.2 | (9.7) | 10.9 | (7.2) | 7.1 | (5.4) | 82.0 | (8.8) |
|  | Maranhão | 32.2 | (13.7) | 32.1 | (12.5) | 35.8 | (13.0) | 20.5 | (11.3) | 26.6 | (11.3) | 52.9 | (14.2) | 4.3 | (4.5) | 4.8 | (4.7) | 90.9 | (6.3) |
|  | Mato Grosso | 19.6 | (6.8) | 51.3 | (11.7) | 29.1 | (10.5) | 17.0 | (6.2) | 41.7 | (10.2) | 41.3 | (11.8) | 5.8 | (5.8) | 19.5 | (5.9) | 74.7 | (7.9) |
|  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 49.8 | (13.2) | 15.2 | (8.0) | 35.0 | (10.7) | 33.8 | (9.9) | 19.9 | (7.3) | 46.3 | (9.6) | 4.9 | (4.5) | 0.0 | c | 95.1 | (4.5) |
|  | Minas Gerais | 62.9 | (7.4) | 23.7 | (8.0) | 13.4 | (6.5) | 34.7 | (10.2) | 31.0 | (9.0) | 34.3 | (10.3) | 0.0 | c | 11.4 | (7.6) | 88.6 | (7.6) |
|  | Pará | 30.4 | (8.5) | 27.8 | (8.3) | 41.7 | (7.8) | 26.6 | (11.6) | 20.2 | (5.7) | 53.1 | (13.1) | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (5.8) | 93.9 | (5.8) |
|  | Paraíba | 74.8 | (10.2) | 19.1 | (8.9) | 6.1 | (4.5) | 23.4 | (14.4) | 31.7 | (11.8) | 44.8 | (15.2) | 5.4 | (6.2) | 14.2 | (8.6) | 80.4 | (11.8) |
|  | Paraná | 36.2 | (10.1) | 42.4 | (11.0) | 21.4 | (7.7) | 7.4 | (5.2) | 22.9 | (10.9) | 69.8 | (11.3) | 4.6 | (4.2) | 17.8 | (9.2) | 77.6 | (10.0) |
|  | Pernambuco | 54.5 | (9.3) | 30.9 | (9.0) | 14.5 | (8.2) | 28.1 | (9.3) | 19.7 | (11.7) | 52.2 | (14.0) | 6.0 | (6.0) | 0.0 | c | 94.0 | (6.0) |
|  | Piauí | 45.9 | (11.2) | 36.3 | (12.5) | 17.8 | (6.1) | 12.1 | (2.1) | 34.8 | (13.1) | 53.1 | (12.1) | 3.8 | (2.0) | 27.7 | (11.1) | 68.5 | (10.9) |
|  | Rio de Janeiro | 53.8 | (6.6) | 24.5 | (7.4) | 21.7 | (7.9) | 24.2 | (11.7) | 15.0 | (7.8) | 60.8 | (13.2) | 2.7 | (4.1) | 15.0 | (8.6) | 82.3 | (10.1) |
|  | Rio Grande do Norte | 25.8 | (11.1) | 44.5 | (11.1) | 29.7 | (11.1) | 21.6 | (10.6) | 34.3 | (12.4) | 44.1 | (11.2) | 7.9 | (7.6) | 13.0 | (8.8) | 79.1 | (11.2) |
|  | Rio Grande do Sul | 53.1 | (11.7) | 20.8 | (11.2) | 26.1 | (9.7) | 29.1 | (11.9) | 17.5 | (9.0) | 53.4 | (12.0) | 12.5 | (8.3) | 5.1 | (4.9) | 82.4 | (9.2) |
|  | Rondônia | 7.9 | (5.2) | 44.2 | (11.6) | 47.9 | (12.4) | 9.9 | (6.4) | 40.8 | (10.7) | 49.3 | (11.1) | 0.0 | c | 14.0 | (8.9) | 86.0 | (8.9) |
|  | Roraima | 27.1 | (10.0) | 47.7 | (11.9) | 25.3 | (11.6) | 18.7 | (9.6) | 32.9 | (10.9) | 48.4 | (10.7) | 9.4 | (6.7) | 7.8 | (5.8) | 82.8 | (9.1) |
|  | Santa Catarina | 44.3 | (11.2) | 16.8 | (6.5) | 38.9 | (11.6) | 8.5 | (4.7) | 31.8 | (10.8) | 59.7 | (11.5) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 | c |
|  | São Paulo | 51.6 | (7.1) | 29.2 | (6.2) | 19.2 | (5.2) | 26.8 | (6.8) | 19.2 | (5.5) | 54.0 | (6.7) | 6.8 | (3.4) | 18.7 | (5.3) | 74.5 | (5.3) |
|  | Sergipe | 46.5 | (10.5) | 35.1 | (9.2) | 18.4 | (10.4) | 5.1 | (4.2) | 68.3 | (13.1) | 26.5 | (12.8) | 0.0 | c | 23.1 | (14.5) | 76.9 | (14.5) |
|  | Tocantins | 41.0 | (9.8) | 43.5 | (9.5) | 15.5 | (6.1) | 26.3 | (8.7) | 33.3 | (9.3) | 40.4 | (8.8) | 4.1 | (4.2) | 0.0 | C | 95.9 | (4.2) |
|  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bogota | 35.9 | (7.8) | 59.6 | (6.9) | 4.4 | (3.1) | 25.6 | (7.1) | 57.7 | (8.6) | 16.6 | (6.3) | 9.3 | (4.6) | 49.2 | (8.3) | 41.4 | (7.7) |
|  | Cali | 45.7 | (9.1) | 40.0 | (9.2) | 14.3 | (6.0) | 41.2 | (9.0) | 33.3 | (7.6) | 25.5 | (8.1) | 6.8 | (3.3) | 53.2 | (8.3) | 40.1 | (8.8) |
|  | Manizales | 36.4 | (7.9) | 52.9 | (8.2) | 10.6 | (4.3) | 27.6 | (7.4) | 40.2 | (6.2) | 32.1 | (7.8) | 15.2 | (6.1) | 59.1 | (8.4) | 25.6 | (7.1) |
|  | Medellin | 21.5 | (6.3) | 72.7 | (5.6) | 5.7 | (3.4) | 18.3 | (5.9) | 47.9 | (7.4) | 33.8 | (7.8) | 1.6 | (1.5) | 62.8 | (7.9) | 35.6 | (7.6) |
|  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perm Territory region* | 43.0 | (6.0) | 53.7 | (5.5) | 3.3 | (2.4) | 19.3 | (5.4) | 33.9 | (5.9) | 46.8 | (7.5) | 12.4 | (4.5) | 75.1 | (5.4) | 12.5 | (4.5) |
|  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abu Dhabi* | 57.5 | (4.5) | 27.4 | (4.3) | 15.1 | (3.1) | 38.6 | (4.0) | 23.2 | (4.1) | 38.2 | (4.3) | 47.8 | (4.3) | 35.7 | (4.3) | 16.5 | (3.3) |
|  | Ajman | 75.2 | (7.4) | 8.5 | (7.1) | 16.2 | (2.0) | 19.5 | (5.6) | 12.5 | (6.2) | 67.9 | (4.8) | 50.0 | (7.8) | 34.6 | (7.5) | 15.3 | (3.6) |
|  | Dubai ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 55.6 | (0.3) | 28.6 | (0.2) | 15.8 | (0.2) | 22.3 | (0.2) | 30.1 | (0.2) | 47.6 | (0.3) | 54.1 | (0.3) | 32.6 | (0.3) | 13.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Fujairah | 41.2 | (5.6) | 56.3 | (6.6) | 2.6 | (3.6) | 46.3 | (3.7) | 38.7 | (6.5) | 14.9 | (5.6) | 38.1 | (3.9) | 61.3 | (3.9) | 0.6 | (0.2) |
|  | Ras Al Khaimah | 68.2 | (8.8) | 18.3 | (7.7) | 13.5 | (5.3) | 37.6 | (10.1) | 29.6 | (10.8) | 32.8 | (11.5) | 59.1 | (11.0) | 26.8 | (9.7) | 14.2 | (6.9) |
|  | Sharjah | 52.7 | (10.4) | 15.6 | (6.3) | 31.7 | (9.4) | 27.1 | (10.5) | 7.8 | (4.8) | 65.1 | (9.4) | 7.8 | (3.4) | 47.3 | (7.6) | 44.8 | (7.4) |
|  | Umm Al Quwain | 94.6 | (0.3) | 4.7 | (0.2) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 48.0 | (0.3) | 29.8 | (0.3) | 22.1 | (0.5) | 39.9 | (0.2) | 47.0 | (0.4) | 13.1 | (0.3) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.11 for national data.
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[Part 3/4]
Ability grouping for mathematics classes, by region
Table B2.IV. 4 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In mathematics classes, teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 18.4 | (0.8) | 49.2 | (0.9) | 32.4 | (1.0) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 26.0 | (0.9) | 72.8 | (0.9) |
| - New South Wales | 16.4 | (2.6) | 43.0 | (3.4) | 40.6 | (3.7) | 1.8 | (1.0) | 38.9 | (3.6) | 59.3 | (3.5) |
| Northern territory | 3.8 | (0.9) | 47.5 | (9.7) | 48.8 | (9.7) | 0.0 | c | 39.6 | (4.9) | 60.4 | (4.9) |
| Queensland | 23.8 | (3.8) | 57.1 | (4.3) | 19.1 | (3.4) | 0.0 | c | 54.3 | (4.3) | 45.7 | (4.3) |
| South Australia | 22.4 | (4.2) | 55.6 | (5.1) | 22.0 | (4.3) | 1.1 | (0.9) | 59.7 | (5.1) | 39.2 | (4.9) |
| Tasmania | 12.5 | (0.9) | 54.9 | (1.7) | 32.6 | (1.4) | 0.5 | (0.5) | 46.2 | (1.6) | 53.3 | (1.7) |
| Victoria | 30.0 | (3.5) | 52.6 | (4.0) | 17.4 | (3.1) | 3.6 | (1.6) | 56.5 | (4.5) | 39.9 | (4.3) |
| Western Australia | 14.4 | (3.5) | 48.4 | (5.6) | 37.2 | (5.4) | 0.0 | c | 46.4 | (5.9) | 53.6 | (5.9) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 51.3 | (4.5) | 34.0 | (4.3) | 14.8 | (2.8) | 9.9 | (2.3) | 66.8 | (3.9) | 23.3 | (3.5) |
| French community | 63.2 | (5.1) | 18.6 | (4.0) | 18.3 | (3.5) | 36.3 | (5.7) | 42.8 | (5.9) | 20.9 | (4.5) |
| German-speaking community | 0.0 | c | 56.5 | (0.3) | 43.5 | (0.3) | 0.0 | c | 66.7 | (0.2) | 33.3 | (0.2) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 38.4 | (5.0) | 49.3 | (5.4) | 12.3 | (3.9) | 1.8 | (1.3) | 45.9 | (4.2) | 52.3 | (4.1) |
| British Columbia | 39.8 | (6.0) | 47.9 | (5.5) | 12.3 | (4.0) | 10.4 | (3.3) | 54.7 | (6.0) | 34.9 | (5.2) |
| Manitoba | 47.9 | (3.1) | 46.9 | (3.0) | 5.2 | (1.4) | 8.2 | (1.7) | 40.7 | (3.1) | 51.1 | (3.1) |
| New Brunswick | 35.0 | (2.8) | 62.3 | (2.7) | 2.7 | (0.2) | 14.0 | (1.1) | 55.4 | (2.6) | 30.5 | (3.0) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 51.0 | (5.1) | 30.2 | (4.6) | 18.9 | (0.8) | 14.1 | (5.8) | 65.0 | (2.8) | 20.9 | (4.0) |
| Nova Scotia | 32.5 | (6.3) | 64.9 | (6.6) | 2.6 | (2.0) | 2.8 | (1.7) | 68.6 | (6.0) | 28.5 | (5.7) |
| Ontario | 40.1 | (5.9) | 44.8 | (5.9) | 15.1 | (3.8) | 3.0 | (1.7) | 44.9 | (5.8) | 52.0 | (6.0) |
| Prince Edward Island | 49.6 | (0.4) | 47.7 | (0.4) | 2.7 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 72.3 | (0.5) | 26.0 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 18.7 | (3.8) | 49.3 | (4.3) | 32.0 | (4.2) | 14.5 | (3.0) | 49.3 | (4.6) | 36.2 | (4.5) |
| Saskatchewan | 45.5 | (4.0) | 46.3 | (3.7) | 8.3 | (1.5) | 6.7 | (2.1) | 68.8 | (3.5) | 24.5 | (2.7) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 48.1 | (6.5) | 39.8 | (5.8) | 12.1 | (4.4) | 24.3 | (5.7) | 54.3 | (7.1) | 21.4 | (6.1) |
| Basilicata | 26.5 | (5.9) | 45.5 | (5.9) | 28.0 | (4.1) | 30.2 | (5.2) | 53.3 | (5.0) | 16.5 | (3.4) |
| Bolzano | 20.3 | (0.5) | 73.9 | (0.5) | 5.8 | (0.2) | 31.4 | (1.0) | 49.7 | (0.9) | 18.9 | (0.6) |
| Calabria | 50.5 | (9.3) | 33.8 | (8.7) | 15.7 | (5.3) | 14.8 | (5.5) | 64.9 | (8.4) | 20.3 | (6.2) |
| Campania | 51.0 | (9.9) | 38.1 | (9.5) | 10.9 | (4.7) | 14.9 | (4.8) | 34.5 | (6.7) | 50.6 | (8.9) |
| Emilia Romagna | 51.0 | (7.2) | 42.0 | (7.5) | 7.0 | (3.8) | 22.5 | (5.4) | 46.6 | (7.3) | 31.0 | (6.0) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 47.7 | (4.4) | 50.6 | (4.4) | 1.7 | (0.2) | 14.0 | (3.5) | 70.0 | (4.4) | 16.0 | (3.1) |
| Lazio | 45.6 | (7.4) | 37.3 | (6.9) | 17.1 | (5.1) | 33.9 | (7.3) | 40.2 | (8.1) | 26.0 | (8.2) |
| Liguria | 50.4 | (7.6) | 34.5 | (6.3) | 15.0 | (6.0) | 19.5 | (5.5) | 52.3 | (7.4) | 28.2 | (6.8) |
| Lombardia | 32.2 | (7.7) | 46.9 | (8.2) | 20.9 | (7.3) | 29.8 | (6.9) | 47.9 | (8.4) | 22.3 | (5.9) |
| Marche | 42.7 | (6.8) | 47.1 | (7.1) | 10.3 | (4.4) | 32.8 | (6.1) | 53.8 | (6.9) | 13.5 | (5.5) |
| Molise | 33.8 | (0.9) | 33.3 | (1.0) | 32.9 | (1.0) | 19.8 | (0.7) | 59.1 | (0.9) | 21.1 | (0.8) |
| Piemonte | 42.1 | (6.5) | 48.3 | (7.4) | 9.5 | (4.3) | 23.9 | (6.4) | 52.1 | (7.9) | 24.0 | (5.4) |
| Puglia | 47.2 | (7.5) | 42.4 | (6.2) | 10.5 | (4.5) | 27.9 | (6.3) | 51.3 | (7.2) | 20.9 | (5.5) |
| Sardegna | 52.2 | (7.2) | 34.6 | (6.8) | 13.2 | (5.5) | 28.5 | (6.6) | 56.7 | (6.5) | 14.7 | (4.6) |
| Sicilia | 53.4 | (6.2) | 32.1 | (5.7) | 14.5 | (4.3) | 19.5 | (5.6) | 49.0 | (6.6) | 31.5 | (6.2) |
| Toscana | 49.8 | (8.8) | 33.8 | (7.9) | 16.3 | (6.0) | 24.6 | (7.8) | 54.8 | (7.4) | 20.6 | (7.0) |
| Trento | 51.0 | (4.6) | 38.9 | (4.9) | 10.1 | (2.3) | 19.0 | (3.6) | 49.1 | (3.9) | 31.9 | (4.7) |
| Umbria | 48.9 | (6.3) | 36.4 | (5.4) | 14.7 | (4.0) | 22.1 | (3.7) | 54.3 | (4.9) | 23.6 | (5.9) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 31.3 | (1.0) | 33.8 | (0.9) | 34.9 | (1.1) | 65.2 | (0.9) | 33.1 | (0.9) | 1.7 | (0.1) |
| Veneto | 40.0 | (6.3) | 46.5 | (6.4) | 13.5 | (4.1) | 22.0 | (4.8) | 51.7 | (6.0) | 26.3 | (6.2) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 19.4 | (6.0) | 46.0 | (7.3) | 34.6 | (5.9) | 30.7 | (7.4) | 28.5 | (7.3) | 40.8 | (5.9) |
| Baja California | 24.7 | (9.4) | 41.2 | (6.9) | 34.1 | (9.3) | 29.6 | (8.5) | 38.5 | (9.2) | 32.0 | (7.5) |
| Baja California Sur | 22.2 | (7.2) | 53.0 | (6.5) | 24.7 | (2.3) | 23.4 | (4.6) | 40.0 | (7.9) | 36.6 | (7.7) |
| Campeche | 19.8 | (5.9) | 55.0 | (8.7) | 25.2 | (9.7) | 31.8 | (8.1) | 13.1 | (6.4) | 55.1 | (6.9) |
| Chiapas | 33.3 | (7.5) | 36.4 | (7.2) | 30.3 | (7.4) | 14.8 | (5.0) | 31.6 | (6.8) | 53.6 | (8.1) |
| Chihuahua | 35.8 | (9.9) | 37.0 | (7.9) | 27.2 | (10.0) | 18.9 | (5.0) | 38.6 | (8.7) | 42.6 | (8.0) |
| Coahuila | 37.1 | (8.1) | 32.3 | (7.4) | 30.7 | (8.2) | 34.1 | (9.6) | 28.2 | (8.2) | 37.7 | (8.5) |
| Colima | 22.0 | (5.1) | 41.0 | (8.8) | 37.0 | (7.2) | 42.2 | (5.3) | 24.7 | (6.9) | 33.1 | (5.8) |
| Distrito Federal | 21.9 | (5.6) | 32.7 | (7.9) | 45.4 | (9.0) | 22.0 | (6.1) | 35.2 | (7.8) | 42.9 | (8.6) |
| Durango | 26.3 | (6.2) | 44.6 | (9.3) | 29.1 | (6.1) | 16.6 | (6.0) | 21.0 | (8.4) | 62.4 | (9.2) |
| Guanajuato | 40.1 | (7.8) | 25.9 | (7.3) | 34.0 | (8.1) | 41.7 | (9.0) | 16.0 | (6.0) | 42.3 | (8.4) |
| Guerrero | 32.6 | (6.3) | 28.7 | (8.2) | 38.7 | (9.1) | 28.9 | (9.0) | 35.5 | (7.9) | 35.6 | (7.4) |
| Hidalgo | 21.0 | (7.3) | 36.0 | (8.0) | 43.0 | (8.6) | 26.5 | (6.2) | 31.1 | (7.7) | 42.3 | (8.5) |
| Jalisco | 31.6 | (9.7) | 41.6 | (10.1) | 26.8 | (6.6) | 32.6 | (9.2) | 41.5 | (10.5) | 25.9 | (5.5) |
| Mexico | 41.5 | (8.6) | 30.6 | (6.9) | 27.9 | (6.6) | 28.1 | (5.7) | 30.9 | (7.5) | 41.0 | (7.6) |
| Morelos | 31.4 | (7.6) | 41.0 | (9.1) | 27.6 | (7.6) | 31.3 | (7.9) | 34.4 | (8.7) | 34.4 | (9.5) |
| Nayarit | 18.8 | (6.6) | 44.3 | (7.5) | 36.9 | (4.7) | 28.3 | (5.2) | 26.3 | (5.1) | 45.4 | (6.8) |
| Nuevo León | 35.5 | (6.7) | 27.0 | (5.9) | 37.4 | (7.6) | 27.3 | (6.5) | 21.4 | (6.8) | 51.3 | (7.3) |
| Puebla | 28.1 | (6.0) | 48.8 | (7.3) | 23.1 | (7.6) | 15.4 | (5.6) | 44.5 | (8.6) | 40.0 | (8.7) |
| Querétaro | 14.2 | (5.0) | 33.1 | (7.9) | 52.7 | (8.7) | 39.2 | (12.1) | 30.1 | (10.4) | 30.6 | (7.2) |
| Quintana Roo | 41.9 | (8.3) | 30.3 | (8.9) | 27.9 | (8.1) | 8.8 | (2.8) | 29.6 | (6.5) | 61.6 | (7.3) |
| San Luis Potosí | 36.6 | (7.1) | 32.6 | (9.8) | 30.9 | (9.0) | 23.8 | (6.2) | 35.5 | (6.4) | 40.7 | (5.9) |
| Sinaloa | 16.1 | (5.5) | 50.2 | (9.4) | 33.7 | (8.5) | 24.0 | (8.0) | 35.0 | (9.9) | 41.0 | (9.3) |
| Tabasco | 18.3 | (6.0) | 31.3 | (9.1) | 50.4 | (8.9) | 24.0 | (8.2) | 27.1 | (6.9) | 48.9 | (9.2) |
| Tamaulipas | 38.0 | (9.8) | 41.5 | (10.2) | 20.5 | (8.0) | 31.2 | (7.6) | 28.3 | (10.5) | 40.6 | (9.8) |
| Tlaxcala | 25.7 | (6.6) | 53.7 | (7.7) | 20.6 | (5.9) | 22.9 | (5.6) | 29.5 | (7.8) | 47.5 | (8.7) |
| Veracruz | 33.8 | (7.5) | 43.7 | (9.3) | 22.5 | (7.4) | 28.8 | (7.1) | 34.3 | (7.8) | 36.9 | (7.8) |
| Yucatán | 22.5 | (7.1) | 33.7 | (8.8) | 43.8 | (8.9) | 26.0 | (6.6) | 31.1 | (8.8) | 42.9 | (9.6) |
| Zacatecas | 23.3 | (5.9) | 42.4 | (7.5) | 34.3 | (6.8) | 20.4 | (6.2) | 33.6 | (7.7) | 46.0 | (7.9) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.11 for national data.
StatLink ज्ञाड्डL http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

Ability grouping for mathematics classes, by region
Table B2.IV. $4 \quad$ Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In mathematics classes, teachers use pedagogy suitable for students with heterogeneous abilities (i.e. students are not grouped by ability) |  |  |  |  |  | No ability grouping for any class |  | One form <br> of grouping for some classes |  | One form of grouping for all classes |  |
|  | For all classes |  | For some classes |  | Not for any class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 60.9 | (10.3) | 30.6 | (10.8) | 8.5 | (4.9) | 51.3 | (9.5) | 38.8 | (9.6) | 9.9 | (6.3) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 61.0 | (7.6) | 22.7 | (6.8) | 16.3 | (4.7) | 4.7 | (2.9) | 37.6 | (6.7) | 57.6 | (7.3) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 71.3 | (5.8) | 19.0 | (4.8) | 9.7 | (3.3) | 8.4 | (4.2) | 43.3 | (6.0) | 48.3 | (5.9) |
| Asturias* | 58.8 | (5.6) | 30.6 | (6.1) | 10.6 | (4.3) | 3.8 | (2.6) | 41.9 | (7.6) | 54.4 | (7.7) |
| Balearic Islands ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 61.5 | (6.7) | 24.3 | (6.8) | 14.1 | (5.3) | 5.7 | (3.3) | 40.4 | (7.5) | 53.9 | (8.2) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 52.3 | (4.0) | 36.4 | (4.1) | 11.3 | (2.5) | 24.2 | (3.2) | 54.2 | (4.0) | 21.5 | (3.0) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 73.0 | (5.2) | 15.6 | (4.7) | 11.4 | (4.7) | 9.8 | (4.5) | 47.1 | (6.5) | 43.1 | (6.2) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 52.0 | (7.1) | 32.4 | (6.9) | 15.6 | (4.3) | 3.9 | (2.8) | 45.9 | (5.9) | 50.2 | (6.4) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 41.0 | (7.4) | 29.5 | (5.9) | 29.5 | (7.2) | 6.0 | (3.5) | 49.4 | (7.9) | 44.5 | (7.6) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 76.1 | (6.1) | 11.6 | (4.6) | 12.3 | (4.9) | 9.0 | (4.2) | 40.8 | (6.9) | 50.2 | (6.3) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 62.3 | (7.4) | 27.3 | (7.2) | 10.3 | (4.2) | 18.9 | (5.7) | 40.9 | (7.1) | 40.2 | (6.7) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 60.7 | (0.6) | 19.6 | (0.5) | 19.7 | (0.4) | 6.4 | (0.3) | 43.7 | (0.5) | 49.9 | (0.5) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 48.1 | (7.4) | 35.8 | (5.9) | 16.1 | (4.8) | 9.5 | (4.1) | 44.7 | (7.2) | 45.8 | (7.6) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 61.7 | (6.5) | 26.2 | (6.4) | 12.1 | (5.2) | 0.0 | c | 57.0 | (8.6) | 43.0 | (8.6) |
| Navarre* | 44.9 | (4.8) | 32.7 | (4.3) | 22.4 | (4.4) | 1.2 | (1.2) | 52.8 | (5.8) | 46.1 | (6.0) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 4.6 | (1.6) | 12.3 | (2.3) | 83.0 | (2.6) | 0.7 | (0.7) | 36.2 | (4.1) | 63.1 | (4.1) |
| Northern Ireland | 15.6 | (3.9) | 19.6 | (3.9) | 64.8 | (5.1) | 2.8 | (2.1) | 40.0 | (4.8) | 57.2 | (4.9) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 9.3 | (3.1) | 26.6 | (4.3) | 64.1 | (5.1) | 0.9 | (0.8) | 44.1 | (4.7) | 55.1 | (4.6) |
| Wales | 5.0 | (1.7) | 17.9 | (3.1) | 77.1 | (3.2) | 0.0 | c | 38.5 | (3.8) | 61.5 | (3.8) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 21.8 | (6.9) | 66.1 | (8.3) | 12.1 | (5.3) | 0.0 | c | 52.7 | (7.9) | 47.3 | (7.9) |
| Florida* | 23.9 | (6.1) | 57.4 | (7.7) | 18.8 | (7.0) | 3.6 | (2.5) | 66.7 | (7.0) | 29.7 | (7.0) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 33.2 | (6.8) | 47.6 | (7.7) | 19.2 | (6.4) | 0.0 | c | 54.4 | (8.1) | 45.6 | (8.1) |


| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { n } \\ \text { N } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 56.8 | (9.1) | 26.8 | (7.3) | 16.4 | (6.2) | 26.7 | (7.9) | 49.7 | (8.0) | 23.6 | (6.6) |
|  | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acre | 38.2 | (13.3) | 4.4 | (4.7) | 57.4 | (14.3) | 5.2 | (5.2) | 22.9 | (8.0) | 71.9 | (6.9) |
|  | Alagoas | 15.5 | (10.9) | 31.9 | (12.0) | 52.6 | (12.7) | 10.2 | (9.7) | 50.9 | (13.5) | 38.9 | (12.0) |
|  | Amapá | 24.9 | (9.4) | 21.7 | (9.3) | 53.4 | (11.5) | 11.2 | (6.6) | 39.1 | (8.5) | 49.7 | (9.1) |
|  | Amazonas | 34.3 | (12.0) | 17.8 | (10.8) | 47.8 | (13.0) | 25.4 | (12.1) | 30.6 | (11.1) | 44.0 | (14.3) |
|  | Bahia | 66.7 | (12.9) | 6.6 | (4.5) | 26.7 | (13.0) | 19.9 | (14.3) | 30.8 | (12.8) | 49.3 | (18.6) |
|  | Ceará | 36.6 | (9.2) | 12.0 | (8.3) | 51.4 | (11.7) | 35.9 | (9.3) | 33.4 | (10.7) | 30.7 | (10.8) |
|  | Espírito Santo | 60.7 | (18.6) | 6.4 | (4.4) | 32.9 | (18.1) | 17.5 | (12.6) | 28.0 | (9.8) | 54.5 | (18.9) |
|  | Federal District | 20.1 | (12.6) | 28.6 | (15.2) | 51.3 | (9.3) | 35.7 | (14.9) | 21.2 | (10.4) | 43.1 | (17.1) |
|  | Goiás | 40.3 | (8.3) | 12.6 | (7.4) | 47.1 | (9.6) | 9.1 | (6.1) | 32.6 | (9.8) | 58.4 | (9.3) |
|  | Maranhão | 10.5 | (7.4) | 31.5 | (13.0) | 58.0 | (14.4) | 24.5 | (14.3) | 33.4 | (9.5) | 42.1 | (14.8) |
|  | Mato Grosso | 36.3 | (10.2) | 20.6 | (7.1) | 43.1 | (12.4) | 25.2 | (11.7) | 46.1 | (12.7) | 28.7 | (7.0) |
|  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 38.1 | (11.1) | 29.4 | (9.1) | 32.4 | (6.0) | 24.3 | (7.5) | 14.5 | (7.7) | 61.2 | (11.0) |
|  | Minas Gerais | 56.7 | (11.3) | 23.9 | (9.6) | 19.4 | (6.4) | 12.0 | (6.3) | 19.6 | (7.9) | 68.4 | (7.1) |
|  | Pará | 41.6 | (18.8) | 11.3 | (7.5) | 47.1 | (17.8) | 33.1 | (13.8) | 27.8 | (8.3) | 39.0 | (12.5) |
|  | Paraíba | 36.2 | (16.0) | 36.9 | (16.4) | 26.9 | (10.6) | 6.1 | (4.5) | 19.1 | (8.9) | 74.8 | (10.2) |
|  | Paraná | 29.5 | (11.3) | 30.7 | (9.6) | 39.8 | (11.7) | 21.4 | (7.7) | 42.4 | (11.0) | 36.2 | (10.1) |
|  | Pernambuco | 46.6 | (13.3) | 9.6 | (7.2) | 43.7 | (10.6) | 8.6 | (6.6) | 30.9 | (9.0) | 60.4 | (8.7) |
|  | Piauí | 10.8 | (8.0) | 33.5 | (13.6) | 55.7 | (11.6) | 17.8 | (6.1) | 36.3 | (12.5) | 45.9 | (11.2) |
|  | Rio de Janeiro | 26.9 | (10.7) | 26.3 | (9.1) | 46.8 | (11.0) | 16.0 | (6.7) | 24.5 | (7.4) | 59.5 | (6.1) |
|  | Rio Grande do Norte | 10.5 | (6.7) | 26.2 | (11.0) | 63.3 | (9.2) | 24.3 | (11.4) | 36.4 | (13.7) | 39.3 | (12.6) |
|  | Rio Grande do Sul | 36.9 | (10.3) | 8.4 | (7.0) | 54.7 | (10.1) | 26.1 | (9.7) | 14.8 | (8.1) | 59.1 | (12.5) |
|  | Rondônia | 17.7 | (9.1) | 30.3 | (12.0) | 52.0 | (13.5) | 39.5 | (11.8) | 47.3 | (11.1) | 13.2 | (7.0) |
|  | Roraima | 19.8 | (9.7) | 30.7 | (12.0) | 49.5 | (12.1) | 14.0 | (9.8) | 47.7 | (11.9) | 38.4 | (11.2) |
|  | Santa Catarina | 14.3 | (8.2) | 10.2 | (6.9) | 75.5 | (10.2) | 26.1 | (10.0) | 23.5 | (4.9) | 50.5 | (11.8) |
|  | São Paulo | 36.0 | (5.9) | 22.0 | (5.2) | 42.1 | (5.7) | 15.1 | (4.4) | 26.8 | (5.8) | 58.0 | (6.8) |
|  | Sergipe | 25.3 | (11.6) | 14.5 | (13.0) | 60.2 | (11.9) | 15.6 | (10.0) | 37.9 | (8.5) | 46.5 | (10.5) |
|  | Tocantins | 35.2 | (11.9) | 16.7 | (8.1) | 48.1 | (10.2) | 15.5 | (6.1) | 43.5 | (9.5) | 41.0 | (9.8) |
|  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bogota | 41.2 | (7.5) | 44.1 | (6.6) | 14.7 | (5.4) | 4.4 | (3.1) | 47.1 | (7.0) | 48.4 | (7.7) |
|  | Cali | 47.5 | (8.2) | 32.2 | (8.8) | 20.2 | (7.0) | 12.8 | (5.8) | 22.8 | (6.8) | 64.4 | (8.4) |
|  | Manizales | 26.7 | (8.5) | 59.5 | (6.4) | 13.8 | (4.9) | 10.6 | (4.3) | 39.8 | (7.1) | 49.6 | (7.0) |
|  | Medellin | 24.0 | (6.7) | 53.0 | (7.4) | 23.0 | (6.5) | 4.1 | (3.0) | 67.2 | (6.7) | 28.8 | (7.1) |
|  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perm Territory region* | 27.3 | (6.2) | 67.3 | (6.9) | 5.4 | (3.2) | 0.0 | C | 45.4 | (5.9) | 54.6 | (5.9) |
|  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abu Dhabi* | 65.1 | (4.0) | 24.5 | (4.3) | 10.4 | (3.1) | 10.2 | (2.5) | 27.3 | (4.2) | 62.5 | (4.5) |
|  | Ajman | 70.1 | (5.3) | 27.6 | (5.2) | 2.3 | (0.4) | 16.2 | (2.0) | 8.5 | (7.1) | 75.2 | (7.4) |
|  | Dubai* | 52.6 | (0.3) | 29.7 | (0.2) | 17.8 | (0.3) | 12.2 | (0.2) | 26.9 | (0.2) | 60.9 | (0.2) |
|  | Fujairah | 75.6 | (7.0) | 23.8 | (6.9) | 0.6 | (0.1) | 0.0 | c | 38.7 | (6.5) | 61.3 | (6.5) |
|  | Ras Al Khaimah | 82.8 | (8.1) | 10.7 | (7.4) | 6.5 | (3.1) | 7.0 | (5.5) | 18.3 | (7.7) | 74.7 | (8.9) |
|  | Sharjah | 59.8 | (9.0) | 39.4 | (9.3) | 0.8 | (0.8) | 28.9 | (10.1) | 5.3 | (3.5) | 65.9 | (10.0) |
|  | Umm Al Quwain | 34.4 | (0.4) | 64.8 | (0.5) | 0.9 | (0.3) | 0.8 | (0.2) | 4.7 | (0.2) | 94.6 | (0.3) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.2.11 for national data.

[Part 1/2]
Composition and qualifications of teaching staff, by region
Table B2.IV. 5 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | School principals' report on the following: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percentage of certified teachers in the school |  | Percentage of teachers with ISCED 5A in the school |  | Percentage of mathematics teachers in the school |  | Percentage of mathematics teachers with ISCED 5A in the school |  |
|  | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. | Mean \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 99.6 | (0.0) | 99.7 | (0.0) | 16.8 | (0.2) | 64.5 | (0.7) |
| - New South Wales | 95.4 | (1.5) | 96.4 | (1.4) | 12.3 | (0.3) | 74.9 | (2.0) |
| Northern territory | 99.3 | (0.2) | 99.9 | (0.1) | 21.2 | (2.7) | 46.9 | (3.9) |
| Queensland | 97.9 | (1.0) | 96.2 | (1.6) | 21.9 | (1.1) | 47.6 | (2.8) |
| South Australia | 99.7 | (0.2) | 99.1 | (0.8) | 19.6 | (0.8) | 53.8 | (3.3) |
| Tasmania | 99.3 | (0.1) | 96.0 | (0.4) | 26.9 | (0.5) | 34.2 | (0.6) |
| Victoria | 99.4 | (0.2) | 97.5 | (1.2) | 20.1 | (0.6) | 64.0 | (2.7) |
| Western Australia | 98.3 | (1.2) | 97.1 | (1.4) | 12.2 | (0.5) | 66.3 | (3.4) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 89.8 | (2.3) | 39.0 | (1.0) | 11.4 | (0.3) | 24.6 | (1.4) |
| French community | 83.6 | (2.5) | 39.2 | (1.7) | 12.6 | (0.4) | 20.7 | (1.8) |
| German-speaking community | 74.9 | (0.3) | 39.3 | (0.2) | 12.4 | (0.0) | 46.5 | (0.3) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 99.4 | (0.2) | 95.9 | (2.2) | 16.8 | (1.7) | 62.1 | (3.7) |
| British Columbia | 98.7 | (0.7) | 94.6 | (2.4) | 12.3 | (0.6) | 61.6 | (3.9) |
| Manitoba | 99.1 | (0.1) | 93.8 | (1.6) | 17.3 | (1.7) | 61.3 | (2.9) |
| New Brunswick | 93.0 | (0.3) | 97.2 | (0.2) | 18.5 | (0.6) | 46.3 | (2.2) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 99.8 | (0.1) | 98.6 | (0.6) | 16.6 | (0.9) | 79.1 | (1.9) |
| Nova Scotia | 98.7 | (0.3) | 96.6 | (1.7) | 17.0 | (0.6) | 71.0 | (5.1) |
| Ontario | 98.5 | (1.1) | 96.7 | (1.1) | 14.0 | (0.5) | 60.6 | (3.4) |
| Prince Edward Island | 98.4 | (0.1) | 97.4 | (0.1) | 20.7 | (0.1) | 41.6 | (0.2) |
| Quebec | 88.9 | (2.9) | 92.8 | (2.1) | 16.0 | (0.5) | 73.3 | (3.1) |
| Saskatchewan | 99.4 | (0.4) | 90.2 | (2.4) | 22.6 | (1.4) | 54.1 | (2.3) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 91.8 | (1.4) | 93.6 | (1.1) | 10.5 | (0.5) | 67.4 | (3.6) |
| Basilicata | 88.9 | (3.0) | 90.6 | (3.1) | 11.8 | (0.4) | 51.5 | (3.1) |
| Bolzano | 54.9 | (0.4) | 72.1 | (0.4) | 9.9 | (0.1) | 42.6 | (0.5) |
| Calabria | 89.1 | (3.1) | 89.2 | (3.1) | 11.2 | (0.5) | 75.7 | (3.7) |
| Campania | 93.0 | (2.0) | 91.4 | (2.9) | 12.7 | (1.0) | 72.3 | (4.1) |
| Emilia Romagna | 84.6 | (1.3) | 90.9 | (1.1) | 10.8 | (0.6) | 66.6 | (4.7) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 79.8 | (2.2) | 90.9 | (1.9) | 11.7 | (0.3) | 56.4 | (4.7) |
| Lazio | 90.5 | (1.5) | 92.7 | (1.2) | 12.9 | (0.7) | 74.2 | (4.3) |
| Liguria | 87.8 | (2.1) | 90.9 | (1.7) | 11.8 | (0.7) | 76.3 | (3.8) |
| Lombardia | 80.5 | (3.9) | 86.6 | (3.3) | 11.7 | (0.8) | 73.3 | (3.5) |
| Marche | 88.1 | (2.3) | 92.0 | (1.3) | 11.7 | (0.6) | 71.5 | (3.8) |
| Molise | 90.9 | (0.2) | 94.2 | (0.1) | 12.1 | (0.1) | 62.2 | (0.5) |
| Piemonte | 70.8 | (6.0) | 83.8 | (3.5) | 10.3 | (0.8) | 68.3 | (4.7) |
| Puglia | 87.4 | (4.9) | 89.1 | (4.9) | 12.8 | (0.6) | 63.5 | (3.8) |
| Sardegna | 88.4 | (2.2) | 90.6 | (2.3) | 12.8 | (0.7) | 33.6 | (4.4) |
| Sicilia | 95.0 | (1.1) | 95.5 | (1.1) | 11.8 | (0.6) | 73.7 | (3.1) |
| Toscana | 88.4 | (1.2) | 89.2 | (1.8) | 12.1 | (0.7) | 71.0 | (5.0) |
| Trento | 73.6 | (3.5) | 84.9 | (2.8) | 11.5 | (0.3) | 67.6 | (3.7) |
| Umbria | 90.2 | (1.0) | 92.6 | (0.9) | 11.4 | (0.4) | 78.0 | (4.7) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 74.1 | (0.4) | 91.2 | (0.2) | 10.4 | (0.1) | 70.6 | (0.8) |
| Veneto | 77.3 | (1.4) | 86.1 | (1.0) | 12.0 | (0.5) | 62.9 | (4.0) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 29.4 | (8.0) | 95.5 | (1.0) | 21.0 | (1.7) | 28.6 | (4.3) |
| Baja California | 16.6 | (6.0) | 81.3 | (8.6) | 21.6 | (3.8) | 24.0 | (5.9) |
| Baja California Sur | 25.6 | (7.3) | 87.8 | (2.7) | 18.9 | (2.0) | 19.3 | (5.8) |
| Campeche | 42.9 | (12.4) | 78.1 | (8.4) | 17.0 | (1.8) | 38.5 | (9.3) |
| Chiapas | 33.1 | (8.6) | 85.2 | (7.2) | 26.7 | (3.2) | 26.8 | (8.6) |
| Chihuahua | 31.4 | (12.3) | 91.2 | (3.1) | 20.7 | (1.5) | 38.1 | (8.1) |
| Coahuila | 27.7 | (8.0) | 90.0 | (3.8) | 18.7 | (2.5) | 22.8 | (8.3) |
| Colima | 19.9 | (4.5) | 92.3 | (0.7) | 25.2 | (3.7) | 30.7 | (5.1) |
| Distrito Federal | 24.0 | (8.1) | 79.5 | (4.3) | 11.7 | (0.4) | 24.2 | (6.2) |
| Durango | 16.0 | (3.5) | 85.6 | (5.1) | 22.0 | (2.3) | 25.0 | (6.5) |
| Guanajuato | 43.9 | (5.1) | 90.7 | (2.5) | 39.0 | (4.6) | 24.7 | (5.4) |
| Guerrero | 4.6 | (2.3) | 85.2 | (4.4) | 22.1 | (3.3) | 38.8 | (9.6) |
| Hidalgo | 17.2 | (5.7) | 89.2 | (2.4) | 17.0 | (2.3) | 30.4 | (6.1) |
| Jalisco | 17.3 | (4.5) | 91.7 | (3.3) | 18.0 | (1.3) | 23.8 | (8.0) |
| Mexico | 20.4 | (6.1) | 91.9 | (1.3) | 22.2 | (3.8) | 23.3 | (7.3) |
| Morelos | 30.8 | (9.1) | 85.8 | (4.6) | 21.8 | (2.7) | 18.6 | (8.6) |
| Nayarit | 17.8 | (4.2) | 97.9 | (0.8) | 19.9 | (2.6) | 29.4 | (5.0) |
| Nuevo León | 40.0 | (11.0) | 91.3 | (4.8) | 18.0 | (1.3) | 43.9 | (7.5) |
| Puebla | 33.4 | (10.8) | 86.0 | (5.2) | 28.1 | (4.1) | 23.1 | (8.4) |
| Querétaro | 39.4 | (10.8) | 93.6 | (2.7) | 21.1 | (2.9) | 34.5 | (6.3) |
| Quintana Roo | 37.5 | (10.2) | 86.9 | (5.9) | 20.1 | (2.1) | 34.5 | (9.8) |
| San Luis Potosí | 36.9 | (9.2) | 91.2 | (3.2) | 22.0 | (2.7) | 43.4 | (10.6) |
| Sinaloa | 17.3 | (5.0) | 94.5 | (1.8) | 18.6 | (1.9) | 33.2 | (8.6) |
| Tabasco | 29.8 | (8.4) | 95.1 | (3.1) | 26.1 | (5.1) | 23.2 | (6.1) |
| Tamaulipas | 30.5 | (8.9) | 86.8 | (5.2) | 17.5 | (1.4) | 23.6 | (5.2) |
| Tlaxcala | 22.6 | (6.6) | 90.9 | (4.5) | 22.8 | (3.8) | 28.4 | (5.2) |
| Veracruz | 38.7 | (11.2) | 85.9 | (6.2) | 40.2 | (5.4) | 26.0 | (7.8) |
| Yucatán | 52.8 | (10.4) | 89.4 | (5.3) | 20.1 | (2.8) | 50.3 | (9.3) |
| Zacatecas | 34.0 | (6.4) | 94.7 | (1.8) | 27.1 | (2.8) | 26.9 | (8.7) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.6 for national data
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－PISA adjudicated region．
Note：See Table IV．3．6 for national data
StatLink（्⿹勹口刂
[Part 1/4]
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 6 Results based on school principals' reports


[^48]Part 2/4]
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 6 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of teacher shortage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | -0.66 | (0.12) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.05) | -0.54 | (0.38) | 0.09 | (0.17) | 0.58 | (0.07) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -0.82 | (0.06) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.11) | -0.01 | (0.19) | 0.51 | (0.06) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.90 | (0.06) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.34 | (0.23) | 0.42 | (0.07) |
| Asturias* | -0.89 | (0.06) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.30 | (0.23) | 0.41 | (0.06) |
| Balearic Islands* | -0.71 | (0.09) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.91 | (0.23) | 0.26 | (0.17) | 0.62 | (0.06) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | -0.72 | (0.05) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.97 | (0.11) | 0.27 | (0.13) | 0.66 | (0.08) |
| Cantabria* | -0.84 | (0.07) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.08 | (0.28) | 0.54 | (0.09) |
| Castile and Leon* | -0.79 | (0.07) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.07 | (0.17) | 0.10 | (0.16) | 0.57 | (0.05) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.42 | (0.11) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.07) | -0.21 | (0.34) | 0.70 | (0.12) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | -0.66 | (0.10) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.72 | (0.27) | 0.27 | (0.16) | 0.61 | (0.06) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -0.58 | (0.10) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.68 | (0.24) | 0.53 | (0.22) | 0.73 | (0.08) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -0.92 | (0.01) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.40 | (0.02) | 0.45 | (0.01) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | -0.77 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.01) | 0.21 | (0.33) | 0.71 | (0.08) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.82 | (0.09) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.37) | 0.61 | (0.11) |
| Navarre* | -0.68 | (0.07) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.86 | (0.15) | 0.32 | (0.17) | 0.66 | (0.06) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | -0.17 | (0.07) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.73 | (0.12) | 0.18 | (0.11) | 0.97 | (0.10) | 0.86 | (0.04) |
| Northern Ireland | -0.53 | (0.09) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.75 | (0.20) | 0.81 | (0.23) | 0.89 | (0.12) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.15 | (0.09) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.79 | (0.17) | 0.10 | (0.14) | 1.18 | (0.11) | 0.94 | (0.04) |
| Wales | -0.29 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.06 | (0.08) | -0.06 | (0.16) | 1.04 | (0.12) | 0.92 | (0.05) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | -0.67 | (0.11) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.84 | (0.26) | 0.36 | (0.20) | 0.66 | (0.07) |
| Florida ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.08 | (0.14) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.55 | (0.34) | 0.59 | (0.20) | 1.37 | (0.15) | 1.01 | (0.07) |
| Massachusetts* | -0.62 | (0.10) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.82 | (0.23) | 0.51 | (0.21) | 0.74 | (0.08) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | -0.08 | (0.18) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.03 | (0.17) | 0.19 | (0.37) | 1.62 | (0.33) | 1.20 | (0.15) |
| - Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 0.66 | (0.20) | -0.64 | (0.32) | 0.60 | (0.29) | 0.98 | (0.25) | 1.73 | (0.16) | 0.91 | (0.10) |
| Alagoas | -0.08 | (0.25) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.76 | (0.41) | 0.38 | (0.46) | 1.16 | (0.20) | 0.94 | (0.07) |
| Amapá | -0.09 | (0.12) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.77 | (0.24) | 0.04 | (0.29) | 1.47 | (0.11) | 1.07 | (0.07) |
| Amazonas | 0.29 | (0.23) | -1.09 | (0.10) | -0.31 | (0.36) | 0.75 | (0.49) | 1.82 | (0.23) | 1.17 | (0.12) |
| Bahia | 0.91 | (0.31) | -0.58 | (0.59) | 0.59 | (0.35) | c | c | 2.35 | (0.55) | 1.18 | (0.26) |
| Ceará | 0.32 | (0.13) | -1.09 | (0.15) | 0.15 | (0.29) | 0.79 | (0.17) | 1.43 | (0.06) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
| Espírito Santo | -0.20 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.92 | (0.14) | 0.12 | (0.16) | 1.10 | (0.16) | 0.92 | (0.07) |
| Federal District | -0.07 | (0.19) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.81 | (0.23) | 0.27 | (0.33) | 1.34 | (0.34) | 1.03 | (0.11) |
| Goiás | 0.34 | (0.22) | -1.07 | (0.19) | -0.08 | (0.44) | 0.82 | (0.26) | 1.70 | (0.27) | 1.09 | (0.11) |
| Maranhão | 0.81 | (0.24) | -0.49 | (0.36) | 0.65 | (0.46) | c | c | 1.92 | (0.25) | 0.95 | (0.14) |
| Mato Grosso | 0.38 | (0.19) | -0.73 | (0.28) | 0.13 | (0.19) | 0.64 | (0.14) | 1.50 | (0.41) | 0.89 | (0.17) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | -0.16 | (0.20) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.40) | 0.36 | (0.38) | 1.16 | (0.14) | 0.99 | (0.05) |
| Minas Gerais | 0.35 | (0.21) | -1.09 | (0.18) | -0.10 | (0.40) | 0.92 | (0.29) | 1.68 | (0.17) | 1.06 | (0.09) |
| Pará | -0.52 | (0.15) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.53 | (0.26) | 0.63 | (0.38) | 0.78 | (0.11) |
| Paraíba | -0.02 | (0.19) | -1.09 | (0.14) | -0.33 | (0.39) | 0.19 | (0.17) | 1.16 | (0.35) | 0.88 | (0.13) |
| Paraná | -0.07 | (0.20) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.54 | (0.30) | 0.26 | (0.46) | 1.11 | (0.16) | 0.88 | (0.08) |
| Pernambuco | 0.43 | (0.20) | -0.64 | (0.23) | 0.12 | (0.10) | 0.59 | (0.50) | 1.66 | (0.30) | 0.91 | (0.14) |
| Piauí | 0.06 | (0.21) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.76 | (0.37) | 0.54 | (0.29) | 1.58 | (0.37) | 1.13 | (0.13) |
| Rio de Janeiro | -0.41 | (0.17) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.39 | (0.46) | 0.94 | (0.29) | 0.88 | (0.10) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 0.28 | (0.24) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.24 | (0.48) | 0.85 | (0.33) | 1.59 | (0.25) | 1.09 | (0.09) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 0.02 | (0.19) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.47 | (0.42) | 0.23 | (0.17) | 1.43 | (0.38) | 1.02 | (0.15) |
| Rondônia | 1.07 | (0.16) | 0.20 | (0.15) | 0.89 | (0.29) | 1.28 | (0.12) | 1.89 | (0.24) | 0.68 | (0.08) |
| Roraima | -0.07 | (0.18) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.64 | (0.38) | 0.23 | (0.30) | 1.22 | (0.15) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
| Santa Catarina | 0.30 | (0.15) | -0.76 | (0.26) | 0.03 | (0.21) | 0.61 | (0.19) | 1.31 | (0.21) | 0.81 | (0.11) |
| São Paulo | 0.25 | (0.12) | -1.00 | (0.16) | -0.22 | (0.12) | 0.66 | (0.21) | 1.54 | (0.14) | 0.99 | (0.06) |
| Sergipe | 0.03 | (0.17) | -0.94 | (0.21) | -0.34 | (0.12) | 0.17 | (0.34) | 1.24 | (0.31) | 0.85 | (0.13) |
| Tocantins | 0.04 | (0.16) | -1.09 | (0.09) | -0.24 | (0.38) | 0.32 | (0.17) | 1.16 | (0.24) | 0.86 | (0.09) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 0.19 | (0.20) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.59 | (0.36) | 0.52 | (0.21) | 1.94 | (0.40) | 1.27 | (0.13) |
| Cali | 0.36 | (0.20) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.81 | (0.44) | 0.70 | (0.21) | 2.66 | (0.46) | 1.61 | (0.15) |
| Manizales | 0.05 | (0.18) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.81 | (0.40) | 0.48 | (0.21) | 1.62 | (0.27) | 1.15 | (0.10) |
| Medellin | 0.69 | (0.24) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.33 | (0.43) | 1.35 | (0.28) | 2.85 | (0.41) | 1.62 | (0.13) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 0.66 | (0.16) | -0.80 | (0.20) | 0.43 | (0.20) | 1.09 | (0.11) | 1.93 | (0.28) | 1.09 | (0.10) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 0.19 | (0.12) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.68 | (0.14) | 0.34 | (0.16) | 2.18 | (0.25) | 1.39 | (0.08) |
| Ajman | 0.13 | (0.14) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.70 | (0.38) | 0.48 | (0.16) | 1.84 | (0.16) | 1.31 | (0.07) |
| Dubai* | 0.05 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.95 | (0.01) | 0.31 | (0.01) | 1.93 | (0.01) | 1.34 | (0.00) |
| Fujairah | -0.20 | (0.15) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.19 | (0.50) | 1.60 | (0.07) | 1.25 | (0.03) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 0.63 | (0.35) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.66 | (0.39) | 0.87 | (0.78) | 3.41 | (0.46) | 1.82 | (0.16) |
| Sharjah | 0.13 | (0.30) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -1.02 | (0.32) | 0.48 | (0.77) | 2.15 | (0.29) | 1.38 | (0.12) |
| Umm Al Quwain | -0.18 | (0.01) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.73 | (0.03) | 0.17 | (0.01) | 0.94 | (0.02) | 0.89 | (0.01) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.10 for national data.

[Part 3/4]
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 6 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Explained variance } \\ \text { in student } \\ \text { performance } \\ (r \text {-squared } x \text { 100 }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 530 | (7.0) | 525 | (9.2) | 500 | (8.8) | 508 | (8.8) | -10.0 | (3.7) | 0.7 | (0.13) | 1.1 | (0.89) |
| O New South Wales | 527 | (7.4) | 524 | (8.6) | 500 | (8.3) | 488 | (7.0) | -16.9 | (4.1) | 0.7 | (0.09) | 2.6 | (1.24) |
| Northern territory | 461 | (24.2) | 475 | (34.9) | 450 | (22.7) | 421 | (23.0) | -14.1 | (22.0) | 0.9 | (0.46) | 1.0 | (3.55) |
| Queensland | 540 | (7.4) | 502 | (6.8) | 486 | (7.3) | 487 | (6.5) | -19.7 | (2.9) | 0.5 | (0.09) | 5.1 | (1.46) |
| South Australia | 501 | (8.8) | 483 | (10.7) | 500 | (9.4) | 474 | (8.2) | -7.9 | (4.2) | 0.7 | (0.16) | 0.7 | (0.84) |
| Tasmania | 483 | (8.0) | 498 | (6.9) | 471 | (7.1) | 466 | (8.4) | -9.3 | (3.5) | 0.8 | (0.14) | 1.0 | (0.77) |
| Victoria | 511 | (10.0) | 518 | (8.2) | 493 | (10.1) | 481 | (5.1) | -12.0 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.14) | 1.5 | (1.08) |
| Western Australia | 531 | (7.2) | 534 | (9.2) | 518 | (11.0) | 483 | (8.4) | -14.5 | (5.1) | 0.7 | (0.12) | 3.1 | (1.79) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 544 | (10.2) | 534 | (8.8) | 527 | (14.7) | 524 | (13.3) | -7.6 | (7.1) | 0.8 | (0.17) | 0.5 | (0.76) |
| French community | 529 | (7.7) | 523 | (9.3) | 499 | (8.3) | 488 | (7.1) | -16.9 | (4.1) | 0.7 | (0.11) | 2.6 | (1.24) |
| German-speaking community | 511 | (10.1) | 518 | (8.1) | 494 | (9.7) | 481 | (5.1) | -12.0 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.14) | 1.5 | (1.08) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 519 | (9.2) | 519 | (9.6) | 520 | (7.2) | 511 | (6.5) | -3.5 | (5.3) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 0.1 | (0.41) |
| British Columbia | 530 | (7.4) | 523 | (7.6) | 524 | (8.9) | 512 | (9.8) | -7.1 | (5.6) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.5 | (0.90) |
| Manitoba | 500 | (6.2) | 498 | (5.9) | 488 | (10.1) | 484 | (6.9) | -9.7 | (4.8) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.8 | (0.80) |
| New Brunswick | 503 | (6.7) | 504 | (7.0) | 499 | (4.9) | 503 | (5.4) | -2.0 | (3.4) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.17) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 503 | (7.8) | 503 | (7.6) | 498 | (6.9) | 456 | (11.6) | -23.9 | (7.2) | 0.7 | (0.12) | 5.4 | (2.60) |
| Nova Scotia | 495 | (6.8) | 500 | (7.0) | 503 | (15.6) | 490 | (10.3) | -1.8 | (5.0) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.22) |
| Ontario | 518 | (6.9) | 519 | (6.9) | 511 | (8.3) | 509 | (8.6) | -5.5 | (7.6) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.2 | (0.61) |
| Prince Edward Island | 489 | (5.1) | c | c | 458 | (4.5) | 490 | (5.1) | 0.3 | (3.6) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.07) |
| Quebec | 549 | (6.6) | 532 | (9.8) | 533 | (7.7) | 531 | (7.4) | -7.4 | (4.0) | 0.8 | (0.11) | 0.6 | (0.63) |
| Saskatchewan | 495 | (5.3) | 500 | (5.4) | 506 | (6.5) | 522 | (8.0) | 12.2 | (4.4) | 1.1 | (0.12) | 1.3 | (0.88) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 464 | (18.2) | 485 | (16.8) | 488 | (12.8) | 467 | (17.8) | 4.6 | (11.6) | 1.2 | (0.35) | 0.2 | (1.18) |
| Basilicata | 452 | (13.4) | 448 | (18.4) | 481 | (8.2) | 478 | (13.6) | 15.2 | (6.9) | 1.2 | (0.33) | 2.3 | (2.02) |
| Bolzano | 506 | (5.1) | 527 | (4.4) | 501 | (4.2) | 498 | (3.9) | -7.3 | (2.1) | 1.1 | (0.14) | 0.6 | (0.34) |
| Calabria | 430 | (16.0) | 442 | (13.2) | 425 | (12.6) | 428 | (11.0) | -4.3 | (7.9) | 1.1 | (0.36) | 0.2 | (0.87) |
| Campania | 450 | (17.7) | 476 | (19.7) | 442 | (15.1) | 455 | (24.3) | -0.9 | (10.9) | 1.1 | (0.38) | 0.0 | (1.08) |
| Emilia Romagna | 525 | (16.7) | 514 | (16.0) | 492 | (17.9) | 486 | (22.4) | -17.2 | (11.2) | 0.6 | (0.23) | 3.4 | (3.81) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 539 | (14.7) | 546 | (11.6) | 506 | (9.9) | 488 | (11.7) | -18.1 | (6.2) | 0.8 | (0.20) | 3.4 | (2.19) |
| Lazio | 504 | (19.9) | 454 | (21.6) | 485 | (21.9) | 474 | (12.9) | -9.8 | (10.3) | 0.6 | (0.26) | 1.0 | (2.23) |
| Liguria | 467 | (22.3) | 485 | (14.8) | 510 | (17.9) | 491 | (10.8) | 12.4 | (8.5) | 1.3 | (0.40) | 1.5 | (2.14) |
| Lombardia | 513 | (16.4) | 529 | (14.6) | 520 | (21.2) | 518 | (15.1) | -1.2 | (12.2) | 1.3 | (0.37) | 0.0 | (1.23) |
| Marche | 478 | (10.8) | 498 | (12.0) | 499 | (22.8) | 522 | (10.2) | 17.4 | (6.3) | 1.6 | (0.37) | 2.9 | (2.10) |
| Molise | 465 | (5.6) | 454 | (6.9) | 475 | (7.3) | 440 | (5.9) | -4.6 | (2.3) | 0.7 | (0.12) | 0.3 | (0.26) |
| Piemonte | 504 | (16.7) | 486 | (12.5) | 511 | (20.0) | 493 | (15.7) | -2.2 | (9.9) | 0.8 | (0.25) | 0.1 | (0.87) |
| Puglia | 491 | (19.0) | 454 | (16.1) | 473 | (14.9) | 502 | (16.2) | 4.3 | (9.6) | 0.9 | (0.35) | 0.2 | (1.22) |
| Sardegna | 459 | (16.5) | 446 | (14.5) | 457 | (13.0) | 485 | (19.3) | 8.7 | (10.8) | 1.2 | (0.37) | 0.9 | (2.39) |
| Sicilia | 432 | (15.8) | 455 | (9.5) | 459 | (11.5) | 445 | (19.5) | 5.0 | (9.8) | 1.4 | (0.40) | 0.4 | (1.89) |
| Toscana | 486 | (24.3) | 520 | (21.3) | 531 | (25.9) | 451 | (17.8) | -8.3 | (14.5) | 1.2 | (0.46) | 0.7 | (3.07) |
| Trento | 518 | (13.8) | 533 | (12.8) | 509 | (7.1) | 545 | (11.7) | 8.6 | (8.1) | 1.1 | (0.34) | 0.7 | (1.51) |
| Umbria | 507 | (15.4) | 481 | (18.1) | 485 | (15.8) | 492 | (7.7) | -5.3 | (7.7) | 0.8 | (0.29) | 0.3 | (1.02) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 467 | (5.7) | 510 | (7.4) | 504 | (6.1) | 493 | (6.1) | 9.1 | (3.6) | 1.7 | (0.25) | 0.7 | (0.54) |
| Veneto | 511 | (14.6) | 528 | (13.9) | 544 | (25.0) | 509 | (16.8) | 8.0 | (11.0) | 1.1 | (0.39) | 0.5 | (1.51) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 458 | (10.4) | 458 | (8.4) | 415 | (16.6) | 418 | (8.0) | -20.0 | (5.9) | 0.6 | (0.20) | 5.2 | (2.41) |
| Baja California | 424 | (9.9) | 416 | (14.0) | 402 | (15.4) | 419 | (22.0) | -3.3 | (7.7) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.2 | (1.33) |
| Baja California Sur | 425 | (13.2) | 426 | (10.5) | 401 | (17.6) | 405 | (7.6) | -10.0 | (5.2) | 0.8 | (0.29) | 1.6 | (1.81) |
| Campeche | 394 | (7.5) | 415 | (8.8) | 389 | (9.8) | 384 | (9.4) | -2.8 | (4.9) | 1.0 | (0.22) | 0.1 | (0.43) |
| Chiapas | 376 | (14.5) | 366 | (15.2) | 389 | (14.9) | 361 | (17.1) | -2.6 | (6.6) | 0.9 | (0.31) | 0.2 | (0.96) |
| Chihuahua | 435 | (8.1) | 412 | (13.0) | 437 | (27.3) | 430 | (22.6) | -2.8 | (8.7) | 0.8 | (0.23) | 0.1 | (1.40) |
| Coahuila | 442 | (21.0) | 422 | (14.6) | 403 | (10.7) | 406 | (13.7) | -14.8 | (7.3) | 0.6 | (0.27) | 5.7 | (5.74) |
| Colima | 444 | (10.9) | 439 | (9.8) | 416 | (14.8) | 417 | (14.6) | -10.4 | (6.4) | 0.7 | (0.22) | 1.9 | (2.25) |
| Distrito Federal | 453 | (13.0) | 441 | (15.3) | 422 | (16.8) | 395 | (11.3) | -17.7 | (5.2) | 0.5 | (0.19) | 6.2 | (3.34) |
| Durango | 450 | (11.2) | 420 | (10.6) | 407 | (14.0) | 420 | (23.3) | -13.6 | (6.9) | 0.4 | (0.18) | 3.6 | (3.58) |
| Guanajuato | 419 | (11.9) | 426 | (16.0) | 404 | (17.0) | 398 | (9.6) | -10.5 | (6.5) | 0.6 | (0.20) | 1.5 | (1.86) |
| Guerrero | 375 | (13.4) | 378 | (13.1) | 366 | (12.1) | 354 | (11.7) | -13.3 | (8.0) | 0.9 | (0.27) | 1.7 | (2.04) |
| Hidalgo | 434 | (10.6) | 426 | (14.0) | 383 | (20.6) | 387 | (14.7) | -17.1 | (5.6) | 0.4 | (0.17) | 7.1 | (4.40) |
| Jalisco | 455 | (12.8) | 431 | (11.2) | 429 | (17.2) | 425 | (11.4) | -12.2 | (5.1) | 0.5 | (0.22) | 2.3 | (2.08) |
| Mexico | 432 | (12.4) | 423 | (14.7) | 404 | (11.2) | 410 | (10.2) | -9.6 | (5.1) | 0.7 | (0.21) | 1.9 | (2.03) |
| Morelos | 449 | (20.3) | 417 | (17.3) | 404 | (16.0) | 416 | (12.9) | -17.6 | (10.3) | 0.6 | (0.25) | 4.4 | (4.92) |
| Nayarit | 418 | (12.4) | 420 | (11.6) | 401 | (20.0) | 420 | (11.7) | -3.4 | (6.4) | 0.9 | (0.24) | 0.2 | (0.68) |
| Nuevo León | 466 | (17.9) | 424 | (17.3) | 450 | (17.3) | 403 | (15.6) | -15.4 | (5.4) | 0.4 | (0.13) | 6.0 | (4.20) |
| Puebla | 435 | (12.0) | 417 | (11.1) | 408 | (14.0) | 402 | (10.9) | -12.5 | (5.3) | 0.6 | (0.18) | 2.7 | (2.24) |
| Querétaro | 433 | (10.9) | 437 | (11.5) | 436 | (12.8) | 432 | (21.1) | -4.1 | (6.7) | 1.0 | (0.24) | 0.5 | (1.70) |
| Quintana Roo | 418 | (16.7) | 413 | (10.1) | 404 | (12.8) | 407 | (8.4) | -7.1 | (7.2) | 0.9 | (0.40) | 0.9 | (2.02) |
| San Luis Potosí | 429 | (23.6) | 418 | (28.3) | 402 | (14.3) | 399 | (10.6) | -12.1 | (6.3) | 0.7 | (0.26) | 3.0 | (2.44) |
| Sinaloa | 423 | (16.9) | 411 | (10.8) | 417 | (11.0) | 397 | (10.8) | -8.4 | (7.4) | 0.9 | (0.35) | 1.4 | (2.27) |
| Tabasco | 381 | (16.9) | 379 | (13.6) | 381 | (11.4) | 372 | (10.3) | -1.6 | (8.5) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 0.1 | (1.19) |
| Tamaulipas | 423 | (13.3) | 417 | (22.2) | 393 | (13.1) | 411 | (20.5) | -9.0 | (6.4) | 0.6 | (0.21) | 1.9 | (2.69) |
| Tlaxcala | 416 | (7.7) | 421 | (7.2) | 400 | (17.9) | 407 | (12.1) | -5.2 | (4.9) | 1.0 | (0.23) | 0.5 | (0.98) |
| Veracruz | 415 | (20.3) | 402 | (11.8) | 398 | (12.3) | 394 | (9.9) | -4.5 | (8.0) | 1.0 | (0.33) | 0.4 | (1.63) |
| Yucatán | 407 | (7.5) | 406 | (16.0) | 404 | (13.7) | 422 | (9.9) | 4.3 | (3.8) | 0.9 | (0.21) | 0.3 | (0.60) |
| Zacatecas | 408 | (8.6) | 413 | (11.8) | 402 | (10.4) | 413 | (11.9) | -1.5 | (5.2) | 1.1 | (0.23) | 0.1 | (0.50) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3. 10 for national data.
StatLink (nil|s़ http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 4/4]
Index of teacher shortage and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 6 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 490 | (14.3) \| | 491 | (14.8) | 494 | (19.8) | 490 | (19.5) | -5.2 | (18.6) | 1.0 | (0.23) | 0.1 | (1.26) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 475 | (7.0) | 476 | (8.3) | 473 | (8.3) | 465 | (7.8) | -12.0 | (7.7) | 0.9 | (0.19) | 0.5 | (0.65) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 495 | (8.3) | 495 | (10.1) | 496 | (9.1) | 499 | (13.9) | -3.4 | (22.2) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 0.0 | (0.77) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 499 | (11.4) | 494 | (11.1) | 498 | (10.0) | 506 | (9.6) | 5.3 | (11.4) | 1.0 | (0.20) | 0.1 | (0.31) |
| Balearic Islands* | 476 | (8.1) | 477 | (8.4) | 477 | (9.1) | 470 | (10.1) | -5.1 | (9.2) | 0.9 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.51) |
| Basque Country* | 506 | (4.7) | 502 | (4.5) | 505 | (4.0) | 508 | (5.9) | 2.5 | (4.6) | 1.1 | (0.08) | 0.0 | (0.20) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 488 | (8.2) | 492 | (7.4) | 493 | (8.4) | 493 | (7.0) | -0.6 | (9.1) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.24) |
| Castile and Leon* | 513 | (6.6) | 508 | (7.3) | 510 | (8.8) | 504 | (14.9) | 1.2 | (12.3) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.58) |
| Catalonia* | 503 | (9.3) | 503 | (9.4) | 488 | (9.9) | 479 | (10.7) | -15.5 | (6.4) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 2.1 | (1.74) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 460 | (8.1) | 458 | (9.3) | 466 | (13.1) | 465 | (9.9) | 5.1 | (7.5) | 1.1 | (0.18) | 0.1 | (0.37) |
| Galicia* | 492 | (8.4) | 493 | (8.6) | 497 | (7.8) | 474 | (10.3) | -8.6 | (6.9) | 0.9 | (0.18) | 0.5 | (1.03) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 501 | (7.4) | 502 | (6.7) | 503 | (8.6) | 508 | (5.4) | 1.9 | (4.6) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 0.0 | (0.05) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 505 | (7.1) | 507 | (7.8) | 505 | (9.2) | 499 | (6.8) | -1.2 | (4.2) | 0.9 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.12) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 460 | (7.4) | 458 | (10.0) | 464 | (9.5) | 465 | (9.3) | 4.0 | (6.1) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.27) |
| Navarre* | 516 | (6.7) | 513 | (6.9) | 517 | (9.1) | 521 | (5.4) | 4.8 | (4.5) | 1.1 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.27) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 520 | (6.6) | 509 | (7.4) | 490 | (6.7) | 468 | (11.8) | -22.5 | (5.0) | 0.7 | (0.10) | 4.1 | (1.74) |
| Northern Ireland | 496 | (8.1) | 495 | (8.8) | 490 | (9.2) | 455 | (11.8) | -21.9 | (6.0) | 0.8 | (0.14) | 4.5 | (2.48) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 504 | (5.5) | 506 | (5.8) | 499 | (7.7) | 484 | (6.4) | -8.6 | (3.6) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.9 | (0.76) |
| Wales | 468 | (4.2) | 469 | (5.0) | 474 | (5.4) | 464 | (5.4) | -0.8 | (3.0) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.0 | (0.14) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 508 | (11.9) | 507 | (11.5) | 508 | (12.7) | 500 | (16.7) | -8.1 | (11.6) | 1.0 | (0.15) | 0.3 | (1.26) |
| Florida* | 479 | (10.5) | 483 | (12.2) | 458 | (12.8) | 457 | (7.1) | -10.3 | (4.5) | 0.8 | (0.14) | 1.5 | (1.17) |
| Massachusetts* | 517 | (11.9) | 517 | (10.3) | 528 | (13.5) | 492 | (16.0) | -19.1 | (8.1) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 2.1 | (2.03) |
| $\cdots$ Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 439 | (14.6) \| | 437 | (14.9) | 412 | (27.0) | 382 | (22.7) | -14.6 | (9.1) | 0.7 | (0.27) | 3.3 | (3.96) |
| Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 356 | (9.7) | 369 | (19.4) | 356 | (13.5) | 354 | (18.0) | -1.1 | (5.9) | 1.0 | (0.25) | 0.0 | (0.56) |
| Alagoas | 353 | (15.0) | 347 | (15.3) | 348 | (12.4) | 326 | (14.7) | -10.6 | (8.7) | 1.0 | (0.37) | 2.0 | (3.19) |
| Amapá | 372 | (14.4) | 370 | (19.1) | 351 | (20.1) | 348 | (8.6) | -3.8 | (4.3) | 0.7 | (0.26) | 0.4 | (0.93) |
| Amazonas | 373 | (21.4) | 358 | (10.4) | 352 | (9.3) | 340 | (7.4) | -10.5 | (5.3) | 0.8 | (0.33) | 3.6 | (3.44) |
| Bahia | 392 | (36.7) | 363 | (36.3) | c | c | 359 | (18.7) | -15.5 | (7.3) | 0.6 | (0.43) | 5.2 | (7.29) |
| Ceará | 360 | (11.6) | 403 | (21.8) | 389 | (26.3) | 361 | (6.6) | 1.3 | (5.4) | 1.2 | (0.42) | 0.1 | (0.43) |
| Espírito Santo | 420 | (13.6) | 427 | (22.5) | 412 | (21.2) | 398 | (13.4) | -11.4 | (9.0) | 1.1 | (0.24) | 1.5 | (2.51) |
| Federal District | 446 | (20.4) | 419 | (16.2) | 408 | (29.6) | 372 | (21.2) | -25.3 | (11.3) | 0.5 | (0.22) | 9.9 | (9.86) |
| Goiás | 406 | (19.4) | 378 | (13.4) | 370 | (12.2) | 362 | (13.9) | -16.5 | (8.3) | 0.9 | (0.38) | 6.3 | (6.08) |
| Maranhão | 356 | (35.1) | 322 | (35.9) | c | c | 306 | (24.0) | -8.3 | (13.4) | 0.8 | (0.46) | 1.1 | (3.72) |
| Mato Grosso | 377 | (32.1) | 374 | (22.7) | 358 | (10.7) | 372 | (10.6) | -7.7 | (12.0) | 1.1 | (0.37) | 0.9 | (2.57) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 428 | (15.0) | 426 | (17.5) | 399 | (16.7) | 380 | (19.4) | -19.4 | (8.2) | 0.7 | (0.22) | 6.8 | (5.59) |
| Minas Gerais | 445 | (18.6) | 396 | (16.6) | 388 | (8.7) | 394 | (10.5) | -16.5 | (7.0) | 0.5 | (0.24) | 6.2 | (4.98) |
| Pará | 375 | (10.7) | 374 | (13.6) | 349 | (16.4) | 341 | (10.4) | -20.9 | (5.1) | 0.8 | (0.22) | 5.8 | (3.43) |
| Paraía | 398 | (20.7) | 426 | (13.6) | 408 | (27.5) | 350 | (22.0) | -25.3 | (14.4) | 0.9 | (0.42) | 7.9 | (9.41) |
| Paraná | 370 | (9.7) | 388 | (15.6) | 413 | (12.4) | 442 | (53.2) | 32.1 | (18.5) | 1.7 | (0.50) | 12.1 | (11.94) |
| Pernambuco | 359 | (16.0) | 379 | (12.2) | 363 | (13.8) | 352 | (12.2) | -4.6 | (8.4) | 1.5 | (0.42) | 0.4 | (2.06) |
| Piauí | 433 | (19.4) | 403 | (27.0) | 333 | (17.4) | 371 | (14.1) | -26.9 | (9.1) | 0.3 | (0.14) | 14.1 | (6.21) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 395 | (12.1) | 398 | (15.4) | 387 | (22.8) | 367 | (21.5) | -11.5 | (8.8) | 0.8 | (0.25) | 2.1 | (3.62) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 433 | (28.1) | 372 | (23.2) | 348 | (9.9) | 368 | (24.3) | -25.6 | (11.0) | 0.4 | (0.20) | 11.0 | (8.63) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 418 | (15.5) | 413 | (11.5) | 405 | (16.1) | 401 | (12.1) | -6.9 | (6.8) | 0.7 | (0.30) | 1.1 | (2.25) |
| Rondônia | 399 | (15.0) | 376 | (15.9) | 392 | (13.2) | 362 | (18.1) | -18.9 | (10.8) | 0.7 | (0.28) | 4.1 | (3.91) |
| Roraima | 366 | (15.6) | 375 | (20.9) | 362 | (24.8) | 344 | (9.1) | -7.6 | (7.7) | 0.9 | (0.35) | 1.0 | (2.21) |
| Santa Catarina | 418 | (16.1) | 401 | (25.5) | 418 | (21.5) | 424 | (11.6) | 3.5 | (8.2) | 1.0 | (0.48) | 0.1 | (0.84) |
| São Paulo | 434 | (17.7) | 399 | (11.2) | 390 | (10.4) | 392 | (7.1) | -16.3 | (6.7) | 0.7 | (0.21) | 4.2 | (3.20) |
| Sergipe | 390 | (13.8) | 404 | (24.5) | 374 | (19.3) | 369 | (14.6) | -9.2 | (9.1) | 0.7 | (0.25) | 1.2 | (2.36) |
| Tocantins | 377 | (21.5) | 351 | (13.9) | 364 | (13.2) | 370 | (15.4) | 3.1 | (10.8) | 0.8 | (0.27) | 0.1 | (1.53) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 402 | (9.1) | 392 | (8.8) | 392 | (8.3) | 385 | (7.4) | -5.8 | (3.1) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 1.3 | (1.30) |
| Cali | 399 | (11.8) | 390 | (17.4) | 362 | (9.6) | 374 | (11.7) | -5.8 | (3.9) | 0.7 | (0.22) | 1.8 | (2.20) |
| Manizales | 417 | (11.1) | 408 | (11.0) | 411 | (18.4) | 378 | (13.1) | -11.5 | (5.1) | 0.6 | (0.14) | 3.4 | (3.63) |
| Medellin | 416 | (18.7) | 390 | (12.1) | 391 | (16.7) | 377 | (13.4) | -8.4 | (4.4) | 0.8 | (0.23) | 2.7 | (2.59) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 512 | (19.3) | 477 | (14.9) | 472 | (14.3) | 478 | (12.7) | -6.3 | (9.5) | 0.7 | (0.20) | 0.6 | (1.77) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 410 | (7.5) | 437 | (12.9) | 429 | (12.0) | 414 | (6.6) | -1.5 | (3.0) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.29) |
| Ajman | 389 | (18.7) | 393 | (12.5) | 420 | (11.7) | 411 | (19.7) | 7.0 | (11.0) | 1.4 | (0.48) | 1.6 | (5.10) |
| Dubai• | 484 | (2.9) | 480 | (4.3) | 471 | (3.0) | 425 | (3.2) | -20.7 | (0.9) | 0.7 | (0.05) | 8.7 | (0.77) |
| Fujairah | 413 | (13.1) | 415 | (14.1) | 395 | (23.7) | 422 | (19.0) | 3.1 | (5.1) | 1.0 | (0.22) | 0.2 | (0.88) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 416 | (10.6) | 427 | (12.0) | 416 | (21.0) | 402 | (20.9) | -5.0 | (3.9) | 0.8 | (0.21) | 1.4 | (2.29) |
| Sharjah | 437 | (16.0) | 443 | (14.5) | 442 | (13.2) | 435 | (19.0) | -1.5 | (5.8) | 0.9 | (0.20) | 0.1 | (0.74) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 387 | (7.0) | 381 | (7.6) | 426 | (10.3) | 397 | (9.1) | 2.4 | (3.9) | 1.6 | (0.34) | 0.1 | (0.30) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.10 for national data.
StatLink (.וाIst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 1/1]
Teacher professional development, by region
Table B2.IV. 7 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Principal's report on the percentage of mathematics teachers in the school who have attended a programme of professional development with a focus on mathematics during the previous three months |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean \% | S.E. |  |  | Mean \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ Australia |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | Portugal |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 10.1 | (0.3) | U | Alentejo | 8.4 | (3.3) |
| - New South Wales | 16.8 | (2.1) | $\bigcirc$ | Spain |  |  |
| Northern territory | 15.3 | (8.4) |  | Andalusia* | 10.6 | (3.3) |
| Queensland | 21.7 | (2.2) |  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 7.0 | (3.8) |
| South Australia | 17.6 | (2.8) |  | Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 10.8 | (3.2) |
| Tasmania | 19.6 | (0.9) |  | Balearic Islands* | 5.9 | (1.8) |
| Victoria | 14.7 | (2.2) |  | Basque Country* | 9.7 | (1.5) |
| Western Australia | 10.2 | (1.7) |  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 7.3 | (2.7) |
| Belgium |  |  |  | Castile and Leon* | 5.1 | (1.8) |
| Flemish community* | 9.3 | (1.3) |  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 5.0 | (1.9) |
| French community | 14.3 | (3.1) |  | Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 2.4 | (0.7) |
| German-speaking community | 6.0 | (0.1) |  | Galicia* | 7.4 | (2.4) |
| Canada |  |  |  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 6.9 | (0.1) |
| Alberta | 16.7 | (2.9) |  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 8.7 | (2.4) |
| British Columbia | 7.8 | (0.9) |  | Murcia* | 5.2 | (1.2) |
| Manitoba | 16.5 | (2.0) |  | Navarre* | 9.9 | (3.3) |
| New Brunswick | 16.7 | (3.5) |  | United Kingdom |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 18.7 | (4.2) |  | England | 15.1 | (3.3) |
| Nova Scotia | 19.4 | (3.6) |  | Northern Ireland | 18.6 | (3.4) |
| Ontario | 17.9 | (2.8) |  | Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 13.6 | (3.0) |
| Prince Edward Island | 8.7 | (0.2) |  | Wales | 24.2 | (2.9) |
| Quebec | 25.8 | (2.5) |  | United States |  |  |
| Saskatchewan | 14.2 | (2.4) |  | Connecticut* | 21.8 | (4.5) |
| Italy |  |  |  | Florida* | 20.7 | (3.5) |
| Abruzzo | 11.3 | (2.1) |  | Massachusetts* | 14.0 | (2.8) |
| Basilicata | 16.8 | (4.4) |  |  |  |  |
| Bolzano | 9.3 | (0.3) | n | Argentina |  |  |
| Calabria | 14.3 | (3.9) | $\stackrel{1}{5}$ | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 13.6 | (3.7) |
| Campania | 11.6 | (2.7) | む | Brazil |  |  |
| Emilia Romagna | 9.6 | (2.0) |  | Acre | 76.9 | (9.1) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 11.8 | (4.2) |  | Alagoas | 26.8 | (11.2) |
| Lazio | 11.7 | (2.8) |  | Amapá | 29.4 | (11.0) |
| Liguria | 20.1 | (4.4) |  | Amazonas | 45.3 | (7.8) |
| Lombardia | 15.2 | (3.3) |  | Bahia | 28.2 | (9.8) |
| Marche | 11.6 | (2.2) |  | Ceará | 17.8 | (7.8) |
| Molise | 18.8 | (0.7) |  | Espírito Santo | 32.5 | (5.3) |
| Piemonte | 13.7 | (3.7) |  | Federal District | 25.4 | (9.9) |
| Puglia | 13.5 | (3.1) |  | Goiás | 32.4 | (7.6) |
| Sardegna | 8.6 | (2.9) |  | Maranhão | 37.1 | (11.7) |
| Sicilia | 13.2 | (2.3) |  | Mato Grosso | 24.5 | (8.0) |
| Toscana | 8.3 | (2.5) |  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 34.1 | (8.7) |
| Trento | 27.7 | (2.7) |  | Minas Gerais | 31.7 | (7.2) |
| Umbria | 8.1 | (1.6) |  | Pará | 22.2 | (9.5) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 12.7 | (0.6) |  | Paraíba | 49.0 | (13.0) |
| Veneto | 15.1 | (3.8) |  | Paraná | 68.1 | (9.1) |
| Mexico |  |  |  | Pernambuco | 33.8 | (9.7) |
| Aguascalientes | 21.1 | (5.5) |  | Piauí | 12.4 | (4.9) |
| Baja California | 27.8 | (5.5) |  | Rio de Janeiro | 22.2 | (7.3) |
| Baja California Sur | 27.8 | (4.4) |  | Rio Grande do Norte | 21.6 | (5.4) |
| Campeche | 21.4 | (4.5) |  | Rio Grande do Sul | 19.5 | (7.2) |
| Chiapas | 24.8 | (6.7) |  | Rondônia | 12.0 | (5.8) |
| Chihuahua | 26.5 | (7.9) |  | Roraima | 29.8 | (7.6) |
| Coahuila | 20.8 | (4.5) |  | Santa Catarina | 12.2 | (2.9) |
| Colima | 22.8 | (2.3) |  | São Paulo | 23.9 | (4.4) |
| Distrito Federal | 16.7 | (4.3) |  | Sergipe | 14.0 | (6.8) |
| Durango | 16.4 | (3.5) |  | Tocantins | 13.8 | (4.3) |
| Guanajuato | 15.0 | (4.6) |  | Colombia |  |  |
| Guerrero | 25.8 | (4.2) |  | Bogota | 20.3 | (4.6) |
| Hidalgo | 10.3 | (3.2) |  | Cali | 15.3 | (4.3) |
| Jalisco | 26.0 | (6.5) |  | Manizales | 3.0 | (1.4) |
| Mexico | 20.3 | (5.8) |  | Medellin | 10.0 | (3.7) |
| Morelos | 15.5 | (4.0) |  | Russian Federation |  |  |
| Nayarit | 15.7 | (4.3) |  | Perm Territory region ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 10.4 | (1.8) |
| Nuevo León | 39.4 | (7.5) |  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |
| Puebla | 35.1 | (5.4) |  | Abu Dhabi* | 37.2 | (4.1) |
| Querétaro | 23.6 | (4.7) |  | Ajman | 60.8 | (6.3) |
| Quintana Roo | 13.9 | (2.9) |  | Dubai* | 40.8 | (0.3) |
| San Luis Potosí | 32.5 | (8.5) |  | Fujairah | 46.7 | (5.0) |
| Sinaloa | 27.6 | (7.1) |  | Ras Al Khaimah | 28.8 | (8.8) |
| Tabasco | 12.2 | (3.2) |  | Sharjah | 16.7 | (7.8) |
| Tamaulipas | 24.2 | (5.1) |  | Umm Al Quwain | 26.5 | (0.5) |
| Tlaxcala | 48.1 | (5.6) |  |  |  |  |
| Veracruz | 31.3 | (6.9) |  |  |  |  |
| Yucatán | 31.5 | (6.9) |  |  |  |  |
| Zacatecas | 25.0 | (5.4) |  |  |  |  |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.12 for national data.

[Part 1/4]
Index of quality of physical infrastructure and mathematics performance, by region

|  | Index of quality of physical infrastructure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | -0.04 | (0.02) | -1.04 | (0.02) | -0.51 | (0.03) | 0.16 | (0.03) | 1.25 | (0.03) | 0.89 | (0.01) |
| - New South Wales | -0.02 | (0.08) | -1.29 | (0.10) | -0.37 | (0.09) | 0.29 | (0.13) | 1.29 | (0.07) | 0.98 | (0.04) |
| Northern territory | -0.01 | (0.14) | -1.26 | (0.11) | -0.49 | (0.07) | 0.42 | (0.47) | c | c | 1.01 | (0.06) |
| Queensland | 0.39 | (0.08) | -0.89 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.16) | 1.03 | (0.14) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.93 | (0.05) |
| South Australia | 0.14 | (0.08) | -0.84 | (0.13) | -0.14 | (0.09) | 0.37 | (0.08) | 1.15 | (0.14) | 0.79 | (0.05) |
| Tasmania | 0.12 | (0.03) | -0.90 | (0.02) | -0.25 | (0.01) | 0.32 | (0.11) | 1.31 | (0.01) | 0.84 | (0.02) |
| Victoria | 0.21 | (0.08) | -1.05 | (0.13) | -0.15 | (0.10) | 0.75 | (0.19) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Western Australia | 0.27 | (0.09) | -0.86 | (0.13) | -0.15 | (0.10) | 0.78 | (0.21) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.05) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | -0.04 | (0.08) | -1.20 | (0.11) | -0.44 | (0.09) | 0.18 | (0.12) | 1.29 | (0.10) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
| French community | -0.02 | (0.08) | -1.29 | (0.10) | -0.37 | (0.09) | 0.29 | (0.13) | 1.29 | (0.07) | 0.98 | (0.04) |
| German-speaking community | 0.21 | (0.08) | -1.05 | (0.13) | -0.15 | (0.10) | 0.75 | (0.19) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 0.42 | (0.08) | -0.66 | (0.12) | 0.10 | (0.12) | 0.96 | (0.15) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.83 | (0.05) |
| British Columbia | 0.32 | (0.10) | -0.75 | (0.12) | -0.08 | (0.15) | 0.80 | (0.21) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.05) |
| Manitoba | 0.07 | (0.06) | -1.03 | (0.06) | -0.23 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.08) | 1.21 | (0.10) | 0.89 | (0.03) |
| New Brunswick | 0.09 | (0.05) | -0.89 | (0.04) | -0.14 | (0.02) | 0.28 | (0.04) | 1.10 | (0.10) | 0.83 | (0.02) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 0.51 | (0.08) | -0.80 | (0.11) | 0.27 | (0.16) | 1.26 | (0.12) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Nova Scotia | 0.34 | (0.07) | -0.76 | (0.12) | 0.05 | (0.07) | 0.79 | (0.27) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.06) |
| Ontario | 0.26 | (0.09) | -0.87 | (0.13) | -0.06 | (0.11) | 0.66 | (0.22) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.07) |
| Prince Edward Island | -0.03 | (0.01) | -0.55 | (0.02) | -0.17 | (0.00) | -0.12 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.01) | 0.65 | (0.01) |
| Quebec | 0.39 | (0.06) | -0.72 | (0.10) | 0.07 | (0.11) | 0.90 | (0.11) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| Saskatchewan | 0.52 | (0.05) | -0.50 | (0.03) | 0.18 | (0.09) | 1.11 | (0.10) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.77 | (0.01) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | -0.36 | (0.17) | -1.94 | (0.30) | -0.63 | (0.14) | 0.02 | (0.22) | 1.11 | (0.20) | 1.18 | (0.12) |
| Basilicata | -0.08 | (0.09) | -1.42 | (0.22) | -0.45 | (0.09) | 0.26 | (0.17) | 1.31 | (0.06) | 1.07 | (0.10) |
| Bolzano | 0.23 | (0.02) | -1.04 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.02) | 0.68 | (0.05) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.01) |
| Calabria | -0.43 | (0.16) | -2.08 | (0.28) | -0.82 | (0.13) | -0.01 | (0.27) | 1.19 | (0.18) | 1.25 | (0.12) |
| Campania | -0.49 | (0.16) | -1.82 | (0.24) | -0.77 | (0.12) | -0.22 | (0.20) | 0.84 | (0.28) | 1.04 | (0.11) |
| Emilia Romagna | -0.23 | (0.16) | -1.30 | (0.12) | -0.64 | (0.20) | -0.10 | (0.17) | 1.11 | (0.25) | 0.92 | (0.07) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | -0.48 | (0.09) | -1.51 | (0.10) | -0.70 | (0.09) | -0.30 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.25) | 0.86 | (0.08) |
| Lazio | -0.53 | (0.16) | -1.81 | (0.18) | -0.74 | (0.21) | -0.30 | (0.16) | 0.75 | (0.26) | 1.00 | (0.09) |
| Liguria | -0.66 | (0.13) | -2.00 | (0.13) | -1.06 | (0.19) | -0.33 | (0.18) | 0.76 | (0.19) | 1.08 | (0.08) |
| Lombardia | 0.04 | (0.12) | -1.28 | (0.19) | -0.28 | (0.21) | 0.44 | (0.25) | 1.31 | (0.03) | 0.98 | (0.08) |
| Marche | -0.16 | (0.08) | -1.06 | (0.16) | -0.21 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.09) | 0.61 | (0.15) | 0.68 | (0.07) |
| Molise | -0.41 | (0.02) | -1.83 | (0.04) | -0.73 | (0.02) | -0.07 | (0.02) | 0.99 | (0.03) | 1.12 | (0.01) |
| Piemonte | -0.04 | (0.10) | -1.23 | (0.14) | -0.44 | (0.16) | 0.28 | (0.14) | 1.25 | (0.12) | 0.95 | (0.06) |
| Puglia | -0.68 | (0.15) | -2.13 | (0.18) | -1.06 | (0.24) | -0.23 | (0.16) | 0.69 | (0.21) | 1.11 | (0.09) |
| Sardegna | -0.15 | (0.12) | -1.34 | (0.13) | -0.52 | (0.12) | 0.01 | (0.19) | 1.24 | (0.21) | 0.99 | (0.09) |
| Sicilia | -0.42 | (0.15) | -1.74 | (0.26) | -0.72 | (0.21) | -0.08 | (0.12) | 0.86 | (0.21) | 1.04 | (0.11) |
| Toscana | -0.52 | (0.15) | -1.78 | (0.31) | -0.63 | (0.20) | -0.17 | (0.07) | 0.51 | (0.23) | 0.95 | (0.12) |
| Trento | 0.02 | (0.07) | -1.09 | (0.12) | -0.31 | (0.06) | 0.16 | (0.17) | 1.31 | (0.08) | 0.93 | (0.05) |
| Umbria | -0.49 | (0.12) | -2.03 | (0.08) | -0.71 | (0.14) | -0.15 | (0.15) | 0.95 | (0.20) | 1.17 | (0.05) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 0.13 | (0.02) | -1.11 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.04) | 0.56 | (0.00) | 1.10 | (0.02) | 0.89 | (0.01) |
| Veneto | -0.40 | (0.12) | -1.52 | (0.16) | -0.73 | (0.15) | -0.27 | (0.17) | 0.94 | (0.19) | 0.96 | (0.09) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | -0.27 | (0.16) | -1.56 | (0.22) | -0.67 | (0.17) | 0.02 | (0.18) | 1.13 | (0.18) | 1.04 | (0.08) |
| Baja California | -0.40 | (0.15) | -1.46 | (0.23) | -0.77 | (0.18) | -0.19 | (0.20) | 0.83 | (0.17) | 0.91 | (0.09) |
| Baja California Sur | -0.32 | (0.15) | -1.74 | (0.23) | -0.51 | (0.22) | 0.04 | (0.19) | 0.94 | (0.13) | 1.05 | (0.10) |
| Campeche | -0.43 | (0.20) | -1.85 | (0.22) | -0.78 | (0.37) | 0.03 | (0.23) | 0.90 | (0.18) | 1.07 | (0.11) |
| Chiapas | -0.89 | (0.19) | -2.30 | (0.28) | -1.10 | (0.24) | -0.63 | (0.16) | 0.47 | (0.27) | 1.06 | (0.11) |
| Chihuahua | -0.30 | (0.14) | -1.30 | (0.20) | -0.55 | (0.19) | -0.17 | (0.14) | 0.85 | (0.29) | 0.85 | (0.12) |
| Coahuila | -0.11 | (0.13) | -1.20 | (0.18) | -0.44 | (0.14) | 0.19 | (0.24) | 1.02 | (0.16) | 0.87 | (0.09) |
| Colima | -0.03 | (0.13) | -1.30 | (0.25) | -0.19 | (0.08) | 0.18 | (0.17) | 1.18 | (0.12) | 1.01 | (0.08) |
| Distrito Federal | 0.01 | (0.17) | -1.22 | (0.22) | -0.38 | (0.24) | 0.36 | (0.43) | 1.31 | (0.03) | 1.04 | (0.10) |
| Durango | -0.73 | (0.17) | -1.89 | (0.21) | -1.14 | (0.27) | -0.37 | (0.18) | 0.46 | (0.18) | 0.94 | (0.09) |
| Guanajuato | -0.62 | (0.10) | -1.58 | (0.11) | -0.96 | (0.14) | -0.39 | (0.17) | 0.44 | (0.16) | 0.83 | (0.07) |
| Guerrero | -0.74 | (0.14) | -2.15 | (0.25) | -1.07 | (0.11) | -0.33 | (0.20) | 0.58 | (0.19) | 1.08 | (0.10) |
| Hidalgo | -0.36 | (0.11) | -1.55 | (0.17) | -0.72 | (0.16) | -0.05 | (0.22) | 0.89 | (0.16) | 0.95 | (0.10) |
| Jalisco | -0.51 | (0.12) | -1.61 | (0.27) | -0.60 | (0.18) | -0.17 | (0.09) | 0.33 | (0.12) | 0.81 | (0.11) |
| Mexico | -0.10 | (0.23) | -1.73 | (0.42) | -0.43 | (0.20) | 0.44 | (0.39) | 1.31 | (0.09) | 1.22 | (0.14) |
| Morelos | -0.66 | (0.20) | -2.30 | (0.44) | -0.92 | (0.15) | -0.22 | (0.18) | 0.83 | (0.29) | 1.21 | (0.14) |
| Nayarit | -0.76 | (0.14) | -1.98 | (0.17) | -0.98 | (0.10) | -0.61 | (0.13) | 0.55 | (0.32) | 1.00 | (0.11) |
| Nuevo León | 0.10 | (0.21) | -1.51 | (0.38) | -0.26 | (0.29) | 0.85 | (0.31) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.18 | (0.15) |
| Puebla | -0.41 | (0.12) | -1.54 | (0.17) | -0.79 | (0.21) | -0.09 | (0.14) | 0.79 | (0.19) | 0.95 | (0.09) |
| Querétaro | -0.60 | (0.20) | -1.95 | (0.39) | -0.79 | (0.18) | -0.32 | (0.24) | 0.66 | (0.21) | 1.01 | (0.12) |
| Quintana Roo | -0.24 | (0.11) | -1.29 | (0.11) | -0.49 | (0.19) | -0.03 | (0.14) | 0.86 | (0.14) | 0.84 | (0.06) |
| San Luis Potosí | -0.52 | (0.18) | -1.82 | (0.27) | -0.94 | (0.16) | -0.20 | (0.20) | 0.88 | (0.22) | 1.07 | (0.06) |
| Sinaloa | -0.29 | (0.15) | -1.19 | (0.13) | -0.66 | (0.15) | -0.08 | (0.18) | 0.76 | (0.24) | 0.77 | (0.07) |
| Tabasco | -0.71 | (0.15) | -1.91 | (0.24) | -1.07 | (0.12) | -0.42 | (0.19) | 0.58 | (0.28) | 1.00 | (0.12) |
| Tamaulipas | -0.21 | (0.15) | -1.53 | (0.33) | -0.54 | (0.18) | -0.04 | (0.30) | 1.29 | (0.12) | 1.08 | (0.14) |
| Tlaxcala | -0.07 | (0.13) | -1.13 | (0.19) | -0.26 | (0.12) | -0.03 | (0.14) | 1.12 | (0.22) | 0.85 | (0.08) |
| Veracruz | -0.66 | (0.12) | -1.83 | (0.26) | -0.90 | (0.10) | -0.34 | (0.19) | 0.43 | (0.11) | 0.89 | (0.10) |
| Yucatán | -0.45 | (0.13) | -1.78 | (0.16) | -0.75 | (0.16) | -0.10 | (0.18) | 0.87 | (0.22) | 1.05 | (0.08) |
| Zacatecas | -0.77 | (0.16) | -1.98 | (0.13) | -1.17 | (0.22) | -0.38 | (0.20) | 0.45 | (0.25) | 1.00 | (0.08) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.14 for national data.
StatLink (aitाst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

Index of quality of physical infrastructure and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 8 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of quality of physical infrastructure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 0.18 | (0.24) | -0.73 | (0.15) | -0.32 | (0.24) | 0.48 | (0.61) | 1.31 | (0.11) | 0.82 | (0.07) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | -0.17 | (0.15) | -1.52 | (0.30) | -0.40 | (0.14) | 0.20 | (0.14) | 1.03 | (0.16) | 1.03 | (0.12) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.13 | (0.13) | -1.00 | (0.18) | -0.30 | (0.16) | 0.51 | (0.30) | 1.31 | (0.03) | 0.91 | (0.07) |
| Asturias* | 0.13 | (0.10) | -1.06 | (0.17) | -0.09 | (0.14) | 0.37 | (0.16) | 1.28 | (0.12) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Balearic Islands* | -0.35 | (0.11) | -1.52 | (0.19) | -0.74 | (0.15) | -0.03 | (0.14) | 0.88 | (0.16) | 0.95 | (0.10) |
| Basque Country* | 0.21 | (0.07) | -1.05 | (0.10) | -0.11 | (0.07) | 0.68 | (0.16) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.04) |
| Cantabria* | 0.04 | (0.12) | -1.01 | (0.20) | -0.31 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.22) | 1.27 | (0.12) | 0.89 | (0.07) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.12 | (0.12) | -1.38 | (0.26) | -0.11 | (0.14) | 0.66 | (0.22) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.08 | (0.10) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.19 | (0.14) | -0.92 | (0.17) | -0.33 | (0.15) | 0.72 | (0.35) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 0.08 | (0.17) | -1.74 | (0.24) | -0.24 | (0.29) | 1.02 | (0.24) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.27 | (0.09) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.07 | (0.14) | -1.21 | (0.18) | -0.26 | (0.21) | 0.43 | (0.29) | 1.31 | (0.03) | 0.98 | (0.07) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.13 | (0.01) | -1.24 | (0.02) | -0.03 | (0.01) | 0.48 | (0.01) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.96 | (0.01) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.30 | (0.12) | -0.79 | (0.23) | -0.02 | (0.12) | 0.70 | (0.29) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.12) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.01 | (0.14) | -1.51 | (0.24) | -0.41 | (0.16) | 0.67 | (0.30) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.14 | (0.09) |
| Navarre* | 0.05 | (0.09) | -1.43 | (0.20) | -0.28 | (0.12) | 0.61 | (0.19) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.09) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 0.04 | (0.09) | -1.37 | (0.12) | -0.33 | (0.13) | 0.56 | (0.17) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.07 | (0.05) |
| Northern Ireland | -0.28 | (0.14) | -1.89 | (0.27) | -0.59 | (0.12) | 0.11 | (0.21) | 1.26 | (0.13) | 1.21 | (0.09) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.36 | (0.08) | -0.84 | (0.15) | 0.01 | (0.09) | 0.96 | (0.14) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
| Wales | -0.25 | (0.09) | -1.52 | (0.16) | -0.56 | (0.07) | 0.04 | (0.12) | 1.02 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.06) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 0.39 | (0.11) | -0.67 | (0.18) | 0.11 | (0.08) | 0.79 | (0.32) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.82 | (0.07) |
| Florida ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.44 | (0.16) | -0.81 | (0.25) | 0.20 | (0.23) | 1.06 | (0.25) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Massachusetts* | 0.07 | (0.14) | -1.09 | (0.22) | -0.29 | (0.14) | 0.36 | (0.25) | 1.31 | (0.09) | 0.95 | (0.09) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.07 | (0.12) | -1.53 | (0.20) | -0.47 | (0.19) | 0.98 | (0.26) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.20 | (0.09) |
| こ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | -1.01 | (0.12) | -1.78 | (0.11) | -1.40 | (0.16) | -0.85 | (0.27) | -0.01 | (0.08) | 0.77 | (0.05) |
| Alagoas | -0.29 | (0.21) | -1.29 | (0.26) | -0.73 | (0.16) | -0.25 | (0.33) | 1.14 | (0.41) | 0.96 | (0.14) |
| Amapá | -0.90 | (0.08) | -2.07 | (0.16) | -1.21 | (0.14) | -0.81 | (0.13) | 0.52 | (0.14) | 1.05 | (0.07) |
| Amazonas | -0.41 | (0.21) | -1.72 | (0.38) | -0.73 | (0.26) | -0.10 | (0.32) | 0.94 | (0.24) | 1.05 | (0.16) |
| Bahia | -0.66 | (0.30) | -2.43 | (0.50) | -0.95 | (0.44) | -0.11 | (0.46) | c | c | 1.28 | (0.18) |
| Ceará | -0.60 | (0.16) | -1.78 | (0.24) | -0.90 | (0.15) | -0.34 | (0.28) | 0.65 | (0.32) | 0.98 | (0.14) |
| Espírito Santo | -0.43 | (0.21) | -1.63 | (0.47) | -0.61 | (0.11) | -0.33 | (0.19) | 0.87 | (0.46) | 1.02 | (0.20) |
| Federal District | -0.20 | (0.18) | -1.51 | (0.35) | -0.40 | (0.15) | 0.04 | (0.19) | 1.06 | (0.42) | 1.00 | (0.19) |
| Goiás | -0.53 | (0.21) | -2.23 | (0.47) | -0.62 | (0.28) | -0.14 | (0.15) | 0.90 | (0.24) | 1.19 | (0.16) |
| Maranhão | -1.11 | (0.26) | -2.24 | (0.33) | -1.52 | (0.19) | -0.99 | (0.37) | 0.30 | (0.40) | 0.98 | (0.15) |
| Mato Grosso | -0.66 | (0.23) | -2.02 | (0.35) | -0.86 | (0.31) | -0.22 | (0.25) | 0.49 | (0.20) | 1.00 | (0.13) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | -0.52 | (0.19) | -1.72 | (0.22) | -0.96 | (0.34) | -0.22 | (0.15) | 0.84 | (0.32) | 1.03 | (0.12) |
| Minas Gerais | -0.40 | (0.15) | -1.95 | (0.23) | -0.84 | (0.30) | 0.04 | (0.19) | 1.13 | (0.13) | 1.19 | (0.10) |
| Pará | -0.76 | (0.18) | -2.34 | (0.20) | -1.49 | (0.34) | -0.49 | (0.37) | c | c | 1.42 | (0.09) |
| Paraíba | 0.08 | (0.22) | -1.57 | (0.27) | -0.43 | (0.31) | 1.02 | (0.50) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.24 | (0.11) |
| Paraná | -0.63 | (0.24) | -1.92 | (0.28) | -1.20 | (0.23) | -0.30 | (0.26) | 0.90 | (0.37) | 1.12 | (0.12) |
| Pernambuco | -0.71 | (0.25) | -2.14 | (0.50) | -0.91 | (0.22) | -0.40 | (0.29) | 0.61 | (0.36) | 1.09 | (0.18) |
| Piauí | -0.60 | (0.22) | -2.13 | (0.29) | -1.21 | (0.26) | -0.18 | (0.48) | 1.14 | (0.17) | 1.27 | (0.12) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 0.23 | (0.25) | -1.22 | (0.34) | -0.29 | (0.41) | 1.16 | (0.44) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.12 | (0.13) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | -0.35 | (0.19) | -1.90 | (0.14) | -0.92 | (0.40) | 0.17 | (0.33) | 1.27 | (0.17) | 1.22 | (0.11) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | -0.34 | (0.21) | -1.64 | (0.31) | -0.75 | (0.29) | -0.07 | (0.23) | 1.10 | (0.28) | 1.08 | (0.14) |
| Rondônia | -0.92 | (0.20) | -2.01 | (0.27) | -1.12 | (0.28) | -0.57 | (0.18) | 0.01 | (0.27) | 0.83 | (0.12) |
| Roraima | -0.71 | (0.23) | -2.18 | (0.31) | -1.01 | (0.33) | -0.25 | (0.20) | 0.60 | (0.29) | 1.10 | (0.14) |
| Santa Catarina | -0.50 | (0.25) | -1.94 | (0.31) | -1.10 | (0.34) | 0.06 | (0.37) | 1.02 | (0.27) | 1.19 | (0.15) |
| São Paulo | -0.06 | (0.10) | -1.45 | (0.17) | -0.43 | (0.15) | 0.39 | (0.16) | 1.28 | (0.12) | 1.05 | (0.09) |
| Sergipe | -0.55 | (0.22) | -1.92 | (0.34) | -0.89 | (0.48) | 0.00 | (0.20) | 0.63 | (0.21) | 1.06 | (0.15) |
| Tocantins | -0.75 | (0.17) | -1.93 | (0.24) | -0.88 | (0.27) | -0.59 | (0.11) | 0.40 | (0.30) | 0.94 | (0.11) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | -0.37 | (0.15) | -1.75 | (0.28) | -0.48 | (0.23) | -0.01 | (0.14) | 0.74 | (0.14) | 0.99 | (0.10) |
| Cali | -0.36 | (0.20) | -2.47 | (0.28) | -0.80 | (0.35) | 0.55 | (0.35) | 1.31 | (0.02) | 1.49 | (0.12) |
| Manizales | -0.14 | (0.19) | -2.19 | (0.35) | -0.35 | (0.29) | 0.68 | (0.27) | 1.31 | (0.04) | 1.37 | (0.13) |
| Medellin | -0.39 | (0.16) | -2.01 | (0.16) | -0.91 | (0.27) | 0.13 | (0.23) | 1.23 | (0.16) | 1.26 | (0.08) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 0.21 | (0.15) | -1.04 | (0.22) | -0.12 | (0.17) | 0.70 | (0.31) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 0.96 | (0.09) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | -0.02 | (0.10) | -1.72 | (0.17) | -0.35 | (0.15) | 0.71 | (0.17) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.23 | (0.06) |
| Ajman | 0.11 | (0.17) | -1.67 | (0.23) | -0.18 | (0.23) | 0.99 | (0.36) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.22 | (0.07) |
| Dubai* | 0.37 | (0.00) | -1.28 | (0.01) | 0.25 | (0.01) | 1.22 | (0.01) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.13 | (0.00) |
| Fujairah | 0.17 | (0.15) | -1.12 | (0.14) | -0.22 | (0.26) | 0.74 | (0.28) | 1.31 | (0.02) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | -0.04 | (0.20) | -1.48 | (0.45) | -0.25 | (0.15) | 0.38 | (0.25) | 1.20 | (0.19) | 1.08 | (0.16) |
| Sharjah | 0.20 | (0.16) | -1.32 | (0.34) | -0.18 | (0.31) | 1.02 | (0.28) | 1.31 | (0.00) | 1.13 | (0.15) |
| Umm Al Quwain | -0.32 | (0.01) | -2.15 | (0.02) | c | c | 0.16 | (0.02) | c | c | 1.34 | (0.00) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.14 for national data.

[Part 3/4]
Index of quality of physical infrastructure and mathematics performance, by region

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 515 | (9.8) | 513 | (11.6) | 498 | (9.5) | 545 | (9.1) | 13.1 | (4.3) | 1.2 | (0.20) | 1.4 | (0.91) |
| O New South Wales | 508 | (10.9) | 504 | (11.4) | 514 | (10.0) | 516 | (7.1) | 2.8 | (5.6) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.39) |
| Northern territory | 401 | (30.5) | 481 | (28.9) | 429 | (24.3) | c | c | 19.3 | (10.4) | 1.4 | (0.56) | 3.0 | (2.95) |
| Queensland | 481 | (7.1) | 505 | (9.3) | 510 | (7.9) | 519 | (6.8) | 14.6 | (3.2) | 1.4 | (0.17) | 2.1 | (0.93) |
| South Australia | 467 | (7.3) | 485 | (11.6) | 497 | (9.8) | 501 | (9.8) | 15.7 | (5.1) | 1.4 | (0.19) | 1.9 | (1.28) |
| Tasmania | 464 | (7.0) | 471 | (7.7) | 517 | (7.5) | 468 | (7.8) | 6.1 | (4.0) | 1.2 | (0.17) | 0.3 | (0.41) |
| Victoria | 486 | (6.7) | 496 | (11.7) | 512 | (7.4) | 517 | (8.4) | 13.4 | (4.2) | 1.4 | (0.18) | 2.0 | (1.28) |
| Western Australia | 500 | (6.2) | 512 | (9.8) | 533 | (10.1) | 526 | (8.8) | 11.0 | (4.4) | 1.3 | (0.20) | 1.1 | (0.83) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 525 | (10.4) | 528 | (13.0) | 536 | (12.8) | 543 | (12.1) | 4.6 | (7.1) | 1.0 | (0.20) | 0.2 | (0.73) |
| French community | 507 | (10.9) | 504 | (11.6) | 514 | (9.5) | 517 | (7.1) | 2.8 | (5.6) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.39) |
| German-speaking community | 486 | (7.0) | 497 | (11.7) | 510 | (6.7) | 517 | (8.4) | 13.4 | (4.2) | 1.4 | (0.19) | 2.0 | (1.28) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 521 | (10.6) | 508 | (9.5) | 519 | (9.6) | 521 | (8.2) | -1.3 | (6.5) | 1.0 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.33) |
| British Columbia | 519 | (7.4) | 523 | (9.5) | 517 | (8.2) | 529 | (9.4) | 1.3 | (4.8) | 1.0 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.29) |
| Manitoba | 499 | (7.5) | 502 | (5.7) | 487 | (9.6) | 481 | (9.5) | -8.6 | (4.7) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.7 | (0.85) |
| New Brunswick | 511 | (6.5) | 509 | (7.5) | 499 | (5.1) | 490 | (6.2) | -3.8 | (3.4) | 0.9 | (0.18) | 0.2 | (0.29) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 496 | (10.1) | 488 | (10.1) | 491 | (13.2) | 485 | (11.4) | -4.2 | (7.5) | 0.8 | (0.22) | 0.2 | (0.78) |
| Nova Scotia | 513 | (5.3) | 486 | (11.7) | 494 | (10.0) | 496 | (6.8) | -6.9 | (3.6) | 0.7 | (0.10) | 0.5 | (0.56) |
| Ontario | 519 | (9.4) | 511 | (9.8) | 514 | (6.7) | 514 | (6.7) | -0.6 | (4.6) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.19) |
| Prince Edward Island | 488 | (5.6) | 486 | (5.3) | 481 | (7.3) | 470 | (5.5) | -3.6 | (3.6) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.1 | (0.18) |
| Quebec | 527 | (7.0) | 544 | (9.2) | 538 | (7.0) | 535 | (7.7) | 2.6 | (4.4) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.25) |
| Saskatchewan | 505 | (4.6) | 508 | (8.7) | 503 | (6.3) | 508 | (7.5) | 0.0 | (3.3) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.08) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 474 | (16.9) | 496 | (14.3) | 462 | (17.5) | 470 | (28.7) | -1.4 | (8.7) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 0.0 | (0.96) |
| Basilicata | 470 | (8.4) | 460 | (13.2) | 466 | (17.1) | 462 | (13.4) | 2.3 | (5.2) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.51) |
| Bolzano | 505 | (3.7) | 501 | (4.8) | 524 | (4.4) | 501 | (5.5) | 1.2 | (2.4) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.0 | (0.08) |
| Calabria | 406 | (19.7) | 444 | (17.0) | 424 | (24.2) | 451 | (16.0) | 14.3 | (6.5) | 1.6 | (0.59) | 4.0 | (3.57) |
| Campania | 460 | (20.8) | 453 | (25.4) | 449 | (15.4) | 462 | (19.6) | 3.6 | (9.1) | 0.9 | (0.31) | 0.2 | (1.25) |
| Emilia Romagna | 523 | (20.9) | 492 | (20.7) | 491 | (22.2) | 510 | (17.0) | -4.1 | (13.2) | 0.8 | (0.32) | 0.2 | (1.70) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 513 | (19.9) | 539 | (16.8) | 533 | (14.3) | 493 | (15.2) | -11.8 | (8.2) | 1.1 | (0.47) | 1.3 | (1.91) |
| Lazio | 482 | (18.9) | 483 | (26.8) | 469 | (22.1) | 482 | (20.7) | -2.6 | (11.5) | 0.9 | (0.33) | 0.1 | (1.52) |
| Liguria | 494 | (15.9) | 485 | (15.5) | 481 | (12.2) | 493 | (20.9) | -1.8 | (8.8) | 1.0 | (0.32) | 0.1 | (0.99) |
| Lombardia | 500 | (16.3) | 530 | (17.8) | 519 | (20.4) | 531 | (13.4) | 10.7 | (7.0) | 1.4 | (0.46) | 1.5 | (2.10) |
| Marche | 512 | (11.7) | 516 | (15.0) | 507 | (11.0) | 463 | (20.8) | -22.0 | (11.2) | 0.7 | (0.20) | 3.1 | (2.88) |
| Molise | 441 | (5.7) | 453 | (5.0) | 474 | (7.2) | 467 | (5.3) | 10.7 | (2.3) | 1.4 | (0.19) | 2.0 | (0.84) |
| Piemonte | 508 | (17.4) | 515 | (15.8) | 488 | (17.8) | 482 | (8.8) | -12.1 | (7.3) | 0.8 | (0.27) | 1.7 | (2.01) |
| Puglia | 476 | (16.8) | 488 | (18.5) | 470 | (15.2) | 486 | (17.8) | 0.3 | (6.9) | 1.0 | (0.23) | 0.0 | (0.58) |
| Sardegna | 444 | (13.9) | 458 | (14.7) | 457 | (12.8) | 480 | (13.5) | 15.0 | (7.3) | 1.4 | (0.30) | 3.0 | (3.09) |
| Sicilia | 444 | (18.2) | 444 | (10.6) | 441 | (14.3) | 463 | (12.2) | 2.6 | (9.0) | 1.3 | (0.44) | 0.1 | (1.20) |
| Toscana | 484 | (20.2) | 492 | (19.3) | 511 | (14.8) | 501 | (13.9) | 2.5 | (9.0) | 1.3 | (0.49) | 0.1 | (0.70) |
| Trento | 521 | (10.8) | 524 | (14.0) | 526 | (12.9) | 536 | (10.9) | 4.1 | (5.0) | 1.1 | (0.31) | 0.2 | (0.57) |
| Umbria | 508 | (12.6) | 497 | (11.4) | 481 | (25.4) | 479 | (28.2) | -13.1 | (7.0) | 0.7 | (0.25) | 3.0 | (3.08) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 538 | (5.8) | 450 | (6.9) | 504 | (6.3) | 482 | (5.5) | -25.3 | (2.9) | 0.5 | (0.13) | 6.7 | (1.46) |
| Veneto | 500 | (20.7) | 513 | (32.0) | 548 | (21.2) | 530 | (13.1) | 7.0 | (8.5) | 1.8 | (0.47) | 0.5 | (1.41) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 402 | (17.8) | 430 | (10.0) | 447 | (14.7) | 469 | (10.4) | 25.2 | (5.0) | 2.4 | (0.54) | 12.9 | (4.42) |
| Baja California | 390 | (5.1) | 421 | (11.7) | 429 | (16.4) | 429 | (10.9) | 15.5 | (4.9) | 1.9 | (0.47) | 3.8 | (2.80) |
| Baja California Sur | 398 | (15.1) | 423 | (8.4) | 406 | (13.3) | 427 | (9.5) | 9.5 | (4.1) | 1.3 | (0.30) | 1.9 | (1.66) |
| Campeche | 376 | (12.8) | 389 | (17.7) | 408 | (14.4) | 409 | (9.7) | 14.4 | (5.1) | 1.7 | (0.42) | 4.7 | (3.36) |
| Chiapas | 363 | (12.6) | 361 | (20.3) | 388 | (13.1) | 379 | (15.0) | 9.9 | (6.3) | 1.0 | (0.28) | 2.0 | (2.59) |
| Chihuahua | 407 | (13.2) | 445 | (25.6) | 418 | (21.0) | 443 | (14.0) | 8.3 | (8.5) | 1.5 | (0.48) | 0.8 | (1.83) |
| Coahuila | 401 | (13.2) | 406 | (14.7) | 426 | (13.3) | 441 | (22.9) | 19.6 | (9.6) | 1.6 | (0.44) | 5.7 | (5.64) |
| Colima | 419 | (12.3) | 398 | (14.3) | 437 | (13.2) | 464 | (13.5) | 15.8 | (6.8) | 1.1 | (0.30) | 4.3 | (3.27) |
| Distrito Federal | 411 | (8.6) | 429 | (16.5) | 440 | (12.9) | 432 | (18.3) | 6.2 | (9.5) | 1.4 | (0.47) | 0.8 | (3.38) |
| Durango | 419 | (23.6) | 402 | (9.1) | 421 | (12.3) | 455 | (11.0) | 15.7 | (8.8) | 1.2 | (0.47) | 4.1 | (4.45) |
| Guanajuato | 374 | (15.9) | 415 | (13.5) | 426 | (11.0) | 431 | (10.5) | 21.6 | (8.4) | 2.4 | (0.64) | 5.7 | (3.85) |
| Guerrero | 345 | (12.7) | 374 | (10.2) | 368 | (9.3) | 385 | (11.0) | 15.7 | (4.7) | 1.8 | (0.43) | 6.5 | (3.94) |
| Hidalgo | 400 | (10.3) | 381 | (16.1) | 418 | (15.1) | 428 | (14.7) | 14.8 | (6.6) | 1.1 | (0.35) | 3.7 | (3.04) |
| Jalisco | 431 | (14.5) | 415 | (13.9) | 445 | (10.2) | 448 | (12.2) | 4.9 | (8.8) | 1.1 | (0.35) | 0.3 | (1.39) |
| Mexico | 404 | (11.4) | 415 | (13.0) | 422 | (9.4) | 429 | (16.1) | 4.1 | (6.1) | 1.3 | (0.42) | 0.6 | (1.95) |
| Morelos | 420 | (15.7) | 408 | (11.5) | 400 | (22.7) | 458 | (20.8) | 8.7 | (8.5) | 1.0 | (0.36) | 1.8 | (3.62) |
| Nayarit | 403 | (12.3) | 423 | (11.3) | 422 | (11.4) | 413 | (13.4) | 4.2 | (5.3) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 0.3 | (0.89) |
| Nuevo León | 421 | (17.8) | 434 | (12.2) | 440 | (14.8) | 449 | (19.6) | 9.9 | (7.0) | 1.5 | (0.49) | 2.5 | (3.87) |
| Puebla | 392 | (13.2) | 412 | (14.7) | 425 | (8.8) | 433 | (11.4) | 16.7 | (6.1) | 1.7 | (0.43) | 4.6 | (3.00) |
| Querétaro | 410 | (13.3) | 452 | (13.9) | 414 | (18.4) | 462 | (15.2) | 13.1 | (6.6) | 1.6 | (0.42) | 3.1 | (3.06) |
| Quintana Roo | 376 | (13.1) | 414 | (16.3) | 427 | (7.6) | 425 | (8.8) | 22.7 | (5.6) | 2.1 | (0.50) | 7.2 | (3.52) |
| San Luis Potosí | 385 | (13.2) | 393 | (14.6) | 432 | (9.5) | 438 | (17.1) | 23.5 | (6.6) | 1.9 | (0.43) | 11.1 | (5.72) |
| Sinaloa | 407 | (9.4) | 418 | (13.7) | 408 | (13.8) | 415 | (13.2) | 8.1 | (6.7) | 1.1 | (0.24) | 0.8 | (1.63) |
| Tabasco | 367 | (8.2) | 363 | (9.3) | 381 | (12.3) | 403 | (9.2) | 14.6 | (3.7) | 1.3 | (0.26) | 4.3 | (2.13) |
| Tamaulipas | 368 | (10.4) | 421 | (22.6) | 418 | (10.5) | 437 | (15.2) | 21.4 | (5.2) | 2.5 | (0.47) | 9.5 | (5.32) |
| Tlaxcala | 377 | (13.6) | 417 | (14.3) | 422 | (8.7) | 428 | (10.2) | 18.8 | (7.5) | 2.2 | (0.48) | 4.9 | (3.68) |
| Veracruz | 396 | (13.7) | 401 | (12.0) | 393 | (9.6) | 419 | (20.1) | 10.9 | (8.0) | 1.1 | (0.30) | 1.7 | (2.55) |
| Yucatán | 409 | (9.0) | 411 | (14.3) | 402 | (9.2) | 418 | (12.8) | 7.5 | (5.1) | 1.0 | (0.26) | 1.1 | (1.60) |
| Zacatecas | 401 | (12.8) | 405 | (8.8) | 413 | (11.9) | 417 | (11.4) | 5.0 | (6.5) | 1.3 | (0.30) | 0.5 | (0.71) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
see Table IV.3.14 for national data.

[Part 4/4]
Index of quality of physical infrastructure and mathematics performance, by region

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 491 | (13.7) \| | 474 | (35.5) | 479 | (29.5) | 521 | (20.7) | 16.9 | (11.3) | 0.9 | (0.32) | 2.4 | (3.40) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 476 | (6.3) | 456 | (7.6) | 482 | (11.1) | 474 | (10.4) | 1.4 | (3.8) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.24) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 485 | (13.5) | 503 | (10.9) | 491 | (10.7) | 507 | (13.4) | 7.1 | (6.8) | 1.2 | (0.26) | 0.5 | (1.00) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 483 | (15.3) | 499 | (8.6) | 509 | (8.4) | 508 | (10.0) | 10.5 | (5.9) | 1.4 | (0.28) | 1.0 | (1.12) |
| Balearic Islands* | 458 | (12.0) | 467 | (8.2) | 491 | (9.6) | 484 | (9.5) | 13.0 | (5.2) | 1.5 | (0.25) | 2.0 | (1.49) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 499 | (5.9) | 503 | (5.9) | 510 | (5.5) | 508 | (4.3) | 2.4 | (2.6) | 1.1 | (0.11) | 0.1 | (0.17) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 486 | (8.5) | 488 | (8.9) | 488 | (8.5) | 502 | (10.8) | 5.7 | (7.1) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 0.3 | (0.85) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 520 | (9.4) | 508 | (11.8) | 506 | (6.4) | 502 | (9.9) | -7.1 | (4.5) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.8 | (1.04) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 486 | (14.5) | 481 | (11.6) | 500 | (10.6) | 508 | (10.0) | 14.9 | (6.6) | 1.3 | (0.29) | 2.7 | (2.41) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 457 | (9.7) | 473 | (11.5) | 467 | (13.7) | 450 | (9.8) | -2.0 | (3.5) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 0.1 | (0.32) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 481 | (10.8) | 493 | (10.3) | 491 | (7.6) | 491 | (10.0) | 1.2 | (4.8) | 1.2 | (0.21) | 0.0 | (0.28) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 489 | (6.9) | 511 | (6.5) | 505 | (5.8) | 510 | (4.3) | 6.9 | (2.8) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.5 | (0.36) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 498 | (9.2) | 493 | (10.6) | 502 | (10.2) | 524 | (8.5) | 13.6 | (4.8) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 1.9 | (1.33) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 442 | (9.3) | 459 | (12.7) | 473 | (10.1) | 473 | (12.3) | 11.0 | (4.8) | 1.4 | (0.22) | 2.0 | (1.62) |
| Navarre* | 498 | (7.3) | 519 | (5.9) | 517 | (8.0) | 533 | (5.0) | 9.8 | (2.6) | 1.4 | (0.18) | 1.6 | (0.80) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 499 | (6.7) | 506 | (6.6) | 502 | (10.1) | 480 | (12.1) | -6.9 | (5.0) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.6 | (0.93) |
| Northern Ireland | 477 | (12.0) | 461 | (17.0) | 510 | (13.5) | 487 | (13.7) | 8.0 | (5.4) | 1.1 | (0.23) | 1.1 | (1.47) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 493 | (7.2) | 498 | (5.3) | 498 | (6.4) | 503 | (6.2) | 2.0 | (4.4) | 1.2 | (0.17) | 0.0 | (0.26) |
| Wales | 470 | (5.8) | 468 | (5.1) | 465 | (5.4) | 473 | (5.8) | 2.9 | (3.2) | 0.9 | (0.12) | 0.1 | (0.29) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 502 | (15.3) | 506 | (10.7) | 501 | (13.8) | 514 | (14.7) | 8.0 | (9.3) | 1.2 | (0.28) | 0.4 | (1.10) |
| Florida• | 486 | (11.5) | 473 | (10.8) | 458 | (8.7) | 460 | (10.1) | -12.7 | (5.8) | 0.6 | (0.16) | 1.8 | (1.68) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 514 | (10.6) | 490 | (17.6) | 531 | (20.9) | 519 | (15.1) | 3.3 | (6.7) | 0.9 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.57) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* }}{ }$ | 342 | (21.9) | 413 | (18.8) | 456 | (9.8) | 461 | (11.3) | 39.0 | (7.3) | 3.8 | (0.86) | 23.9 | (6.02) |
| 发 Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 345 | (7.5) | 355 | (10.4) | 355 | (8.7) | 381 | (17.5) | 24.1 | (9.8) | 1.4 | (0.28) | 7.6 | (5.55) |
| Alagoas | 323 | (8.6) | 324 | (16.7) | 332 | (23.5) | 392 | (23.6) | 25.5 | (9.9) | 1.4 | (0.45) | 12.2 | (6.43) |
| Amapá | 346 | (9.5) | 355 | (19.7) | 359 | (12.1) | 380 | (21.6) | 15.5 | (8.5) | 1.3 | (0.42) | 6.3 | (7.09) |
| Amazonas | 353 | (10.2) | 347 | (9.2) | 351 | (11.3) | 372 | (15.7) | 5.1 | (7.8) | 0.9 | (0.28) | 0.7 | (2.20) |
| Bahia | 341 | (21.2) | 354 | (31.8) | 375 | (25.5) | c | c | 23.4 | (8.6) | 1.6 | (0.76) | 14.1 | (8.26) |
| Ceará | 345 | (13.0) | 369 | (20.2) | 393 | (13.5) | 406 | (26.0) | 26.8 | (11.8) | 2.0 | (0.68) | 10.8 | (8.08) |
| Espírito Santo | 404 | (16.1) | 419 | (22.8) | 397 | (24.8) | 436 | (49.4) | 17.4 | (13.8) | 1.0 | (0.32) | 4.2 | (7.01) |
| Federal District | 370 | (19.6) | 397 | (12.8) | 433 | (42.1) | 446 | (31.6) | 24.5 | (16.7) | 2.2 | (1.01) | 8.9 | (9.56) |
| Goiás | 347 | (11.6) | 368 | (9.1) | 376 | (11.2) | 427 | (13.5) | 25.1 | (4.8) | 1.7 | (0.46) | 17.4 | (6.31) |
| Maranhão | 315 | (14.9) | 350 | (27.0) | 347 | (18.1) | 361 | (43.8) | 17.8 | (15.0) | 1.3 | (0.37) | 5.2 | (7.81) |
| Mato Grosso | 355 | (12.7) | 356 | (10.7) | 369 | (19.8) | 400 | (24.4) | 17.0 | (10.0) | 1.1 | (0.41) | 5.4 | (5.70) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 389 | (10.5) | 381 | (11.3) | 425 | (23.8) | 439 | (11.6) | 21.9 | (7.8) | 1.2 | (0.39) | 9.3 | (4.89) |
| Minas Gerais | 384 | (10.6) | 398 | (13.0) | 415 | (19.9) | 415 | (8.6) | 10.4 | (5.1) | 1.5 | (0.38) | 3.0 | (2.45) |
| Pará | 349 | (6.7) | 328 | (12.6) | 343 | (18.2) | c | c | 19.5 | (3.3) | 1.0 | (0.21) | 16.8 | (4.14) |
| Paraíba | 354 | (19.1) | 374 | (12.8) | 415 | (22.6) | 439 | (15.2) | 27.3 | (7.2) | 2.1 | (0.67) | 18.5 | (7.17) |
| Paraná | 384 | (9.9) | 396 | (17.1) | 413 | (34.2) | 420 | (49.7) | 10.2 | (10.0) | 1.2 | (0.28) | 2.0 | (3.66) |
| Pernambuco | 350 | (12.4) | 368 | (14.2) | 364 | (17.9) | 375 | (20.9) | 13.5 | (5.9) | 1.3 | (0.39) | 4.9 | (3.75) |
| Piauí | 355 | (10.8) | 367 | (17.9) | 369 | (26.8) | 455 | (15.5) | 28.3 | (4.7) | 1.5 | (0.51) | 19.2 | (3.98) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 377 | (14.1) | 366 | (31.7) | 410 | (26.9) | 393 | (15.8) | 10.2 | (7.5) | 1.1 | (0.39) | 2.6 | (3.82) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 355 | (9.2) | 349 | (7.9) | 352 | (17.8) | 465 | (31.5) | 31.0 | (8.9) | 1.3 | (0.34) | 20.3 | (8.14) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 395 | (16.1) | 427 | (18.3) | 384 | (18.6) | 422 | (14.2) | 7.4 | (6.9) | 1.2 | (0.44) | 1.4 | (2.97) |
| Rondônia | 362 | (12.1) | 373 | (15.5) | 391 | (9.5) | 402 | (11.6) | 16.2 | (8.3) | 1.7 | (0.59) | 4.4 | (4.36) |
| Roraima | 330 | (10.1) | 358 | (10.7) | 358 | (12.4) | 401 | (28.4) | 25.3 | (6.8) | 1.9 | (0.41) | 14.7 | (9.21) |
| Santa Catarina | 410 | (14.5) | 393 | (14.8) | 425 | (16.5) | 433 | (30.0) | 6.8 | (10.5) | 0.9 | (0.31) | 1.2 | (4.10) |
| São Paulo | 387 | (5.4) | 391 | (6.8) | 412 | (11.4) | 425 | (16.5) | 13.5 | (5.3) | 1.2 | (0.18) | 3.3 | (2.40) |
| Sergipe | 378 | (14.6) | 367 | (17.0) | 370 | (13.9) | 422 | (30.0) | 17.8 | (10.2) | 1.0 | (0.44) | 7.1 | (7.58) |
| Tocantins | 359 | (11.2) | 341 | (14.3) | 374 | (23.7) | 388 | (18.4) | 18.4 | (6.1) | 1.0 | (0.35) | 5.2 | (3.40) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 375 | (7.7) | 398 | (7.6) | 401 | (6.2) | 395 | (10.6) | 9.4 | (4.7) | 1.6 | (0.22) | 2.0 | (2.02) |
| Cali | 385 | (17.5) | 366 | (9.4) | 372 | (14.8) | 396 | (12.2) | 2.8 | (5.0) | 0.8 | (0.32) | 0.3 | (1.45) |
| Manizales | 381 | (6.1) | 379 | (7.2) | 423 | (16.4) | 430 | (17.2) | 14.5 | (3.5) | 1.6 | (0.29) | 7.6 | (3.50) |
| Medellin | 369 | (9.6) | 383 | (12.6) | 387 | (20.8) | 435 | (19.9) | 19.3 | (6.7) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 8.4 | (4.90) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 484 | (11.3) \| | 474 | (9.5) | 495 | (18.2) \| | 487 | (13.1) | 0.2 | (9.5) | 1.0 | (0.26) | 0.0 | (0.77) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 405 | (7.5) | 418 | (14.5) | 438 | (9.4) | 430 | (9.1) | 9.9 | (3.6) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 1.9 | (1.32) |
| Ajman | 416 | (17.8) | 395 | (24.2) | 409 | (15.4) | 393 | (8.4) | -7.6 | (4.5) | 0.8 | (0.24) | 1.6 | (2.01) |
| Dubai* | 426 | (2.4) | 486 | (3.1) | 473 | (3.8) | 475 | (4.2) | 18.2 | (1.1) | 2.0 | (0.12) | 4.8 | (0.58) |
| Fujairah | 390 | (6.5) | 390 | (27.5) | 423 | (15.0) | 441 | (18.1) | 25.0 | (6.0) | 1.5 | (0.42) | 8.7 | (4.51) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 398 | (21.0) | 432 | (10.0) | 408 | (18.8) | 423 | (10.4) | 11.7 | (8.0) | 1.8 | (0.68) | 2.8 | (4.10) |
| Sharjah | 419 | (15.5) | 423 | (12.9) | 456 | (16.6) | 460 | (24.6) | 16.4 | (8.4) | 1.4 | (0.42) | 5.0 | (5.03) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 401 | (10.2) | c | c | 395 | (9.8) | c | - | -1.5 | (2.4) | 1.1 | (0.29) | 0.1 | (0.29) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.14 for national data.

[Part 1/4]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance, by region

|  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 0.28 | (0.02) | -0.97 | (0.02) | -0.29 | (0.02) | 0.63 | (0.05) | 1.75 | (0.01) | 1.06 | (0.01) |
| O New South Wales | 0.71 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.08) | 0.25 | (0.08) | 1.18 | (0.18) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Northern territory | 0.14 | (0.13) | -0.89 | (0.05) | -0.27 | (0.19) | 0.48 | (0.30) | 1.26 | (0.09) | 0.87 | (0.02) |
| Queensland | 0.54 | (0.07) | -0.50 | (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.10) | 0.79 | (0.10) | 1.75 | (0.11) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| South Australia | 0.42 | (0.08) | -0.52 | (0.07) | -0.01 | (0.08) | 0.57 | (0.15) | 1.63 | (0.12) | 0.84 | (0.05) |
| Tasmania | 0.42 | (0.04) | -0.52 | (0.06) | 0.11 | (0.01) | 0.45 | (0.03) | 1.63 | (0.06) | 0.83 | (0.01) |
| Victoria | 0.81 | (0.08) | -0.42 | (0.12) | 0.38 | (0.12) | 1.32 | (0.17) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Western Australia | 0.87 | (0.08) | -0.47 | (0.10) | 0.37 | (0.13) | 1.58 | (0.18) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.01 | (0.04) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 0.54 | (0.07) | -0.49 | (0.07) | 0.17 | (0.09) | 0.82 | (0.11) | 1.66 | (0.10) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| French community | 0.71 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.08) | 0.25 | (0.08) | 1.18 | (0.18) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| German-speaking community | 0.81 | (0.08) | -0.42 | (0.12) | 0.38 | (0.12) | 1.32 | (0.17) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 0.55 | (0.08) | -0.36 | (0.06) | 0.13 | (0.10) | 0.62 | (0.13) | 1.81 | (0.12) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| British Columbia | 0.28 | (0.12) | -0.82 | (0.14) | -0.21 | (0.13) | 0.50 | (0.15) | 1.65 | (0.17) | 0.97 | (0.06) |
| Manitoba | 0.16 | (0.06) | -0.85 | (0.05) | -0.16 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 1.37 | (0.14) | 0.87 | (0.05) |
| New Brunswick | -0.25 | (0.02) | -1.21 | (0.04) | -0.40 | (0.01) | -0.08 | (0.02) | 0.71 | (0.06) | 0.81 | (0.03) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 0.69 | (0.12) | -0.39 | (0.06) | 0.20 | (0.12) | 0.99 | (0.32) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.03) |
| Nova Scotia | 0.12 | (0.16) | -0.92 | (0.05) | -0.45 | (0.23) | 0.19 | (0.21) | 1.66 | (0.22) | 1.02 | (0.05) |
| Ontario | 0.23 | (0.10) | -0.98 | (0.14) | -0.19 | (0.09) | 0.44 | (0.12) | 1.66 | (0.18) | 1.03 | (0.07) |
| Prince Edward Island | -0.05 | (0.00) | -0.42 | (0.00) | -0.22 | (0.00) | -0.08 | (0.00) | 0.52 | (0.01) | 0.40 | (0.00) |
| Quebec | 0.24 | (0.08) | -0.81 | (0.11) | -0.11 | (0.08) | 0.42 | (0.07) | 1.47 | (0.15) | 0.91 | (0.06) |
| Saskatchewan | 0.48 | (0.08) | -0.52 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.07) | 0.57 | (0.10) | 1.81 | (0.17) | 0.90 | (0.04) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | -0.24 | (0.10) | -1.33 | (0.13) | -0.58 | (0.12) | 0.07 | (0.10) | 0.88 | (0.20) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Basilicata | -0.23 | (0.14) | -1.40 | (0.14) | -0.67 | (0.12) | 0.06 | (0.13) | 1.08 | (0.30) | 1.01 | (0.10) |
| Bolzano | 0.43 | (0.02) | -0.60 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.69 | (0.03) | 1.65 | (0.05) | 0.88 | (0.01) |
| Calabria | 0.08 | (0.12) | -0.82 | (0.11) | -0.31 | (0.09) | 0.14 | (0.23) | 1.33 | (0.21) | 0.86 | (0.08) |
| Campania | -0.02 | (0.13) | -0.95 | (0.16) | -0.33 | (0.11) | 0.11 | (0.10) | 1.09 | (0.30) | 0.84 | (0.11) |
| Emilia Romagna | 0.18 | (0.12) | -0.83 | (0.13) | -0.27 | (0.12) | 0.32 | (0.15) | 1.52 | (0.26) | 0.94 | (0.09) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 0.04 | (0.08) | -0.82 | (0.09) | -0.33 | (0.11) | 0.24 | (0.11) | 1.09 | (0.12) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
| Lazio | -0.13 | (0.14) | -1.21 | (0.26) | -0.39 | (0.13) | 0.08 | (0.11) | 0.98 | (0.30) | 0.94 | (0.16) |
| Liguria | -0.08 | (0.08) | -1.10 | (0.14) | -0.36 | (0.16) | 0.23 | (0.09) | 0.94 | (0.11) | 0.82 | (0.07) |
| Lombardia | 0.31 | (0.16) | -0.85 | (0.25) | -0.08 | (0.10) | 0.51 | (0.23) | 1.68 | (0.20) | 0.99 | (0.09) |
| Marche | -0.13 | (0.07) | -0.87 | (0.09) | -0.35 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.15) | 0.63 | (0.07) | 0.59 | (0.04) |
| Molise | -0.13 | (0.02) | -1.13 | (0.03) | -0.37 | (0.02) | -0.02 | (0.01) | 1.01 | (0.04) | 0.85 | (0.01) |
| Piemonte | 0.10 | (0.08) | -0.72 | (0.13) | -0.14 | (0.08) | 0.27 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.12) | 0.67 | (0.06) |
| Puglia | 0.04 | (0.13) | -0.85 | (0.11) | -0.38 | (0.10) | 0.07 | (0.20) | 1.30 | (0.25) | 0.86 | (0.09) |
| Sardegna | -0.40 | (0.14) | -1.62 | (0.31) | -0.66 | (0.09) | -0.17 | (0.21) | 0.83 | (0.20) | 1.01 | (0.14) |
| Sicilia | 0.11 | (0.13) | -0.88 | (0.12) | -0.20 | (0.19) | 0.31 | (0.11) | 1.23 | (0.20) | 0.83 | (0.07) |
| Toscana | -0.19 | (0.10) | -0.89 | (0.17) | -0.37 | (0.08) | -0.12 | (0.07) | 0.63 | (0.22) | 0.64 | (0.11) |
| Trento | 0.51 | (0.10) | -0.47 | (0.09) | -0.01 | (0.10) | 0.66 | (0.17) | 1.88 | (0.10) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| Umbria | -0.25 | (0.10) | -1.37 | (0.10) | -0.55 | (0.13) | 0.01 | (0.18) | 0.90 | (0.11) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 0.51 | (0.02) | -0.41 | (0.02) | 0.16 | (0.01) | 0.60 | (0.04) | 1.68 | (0.02) | 0.84 | (0.01) |
| Veneto | 0.03 | (0.13) | -0.91 | (0.10) | -0.42 | (0.08) | 0.06 | (0.15) | 1.38 | (0.33) | 0.92 | (0.11) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | -0.97 | (0.09) | -2.23 | (0.21) | -1.28 | (0.10) | -0.61 | (0.17) | 0.24 | (0.17) | 1.00 | (0.11) |
| Baja California | -0.73 | (0.15) | -2.11 | (0.22) | -1.04 | (0.28) | -0.32 | (0.13) | 0.57 | (0.18) | 1.09 | (0.12) |
| Baja California Sur | -1.09 | (0.14) | -2.47 | (0.27) | -1.44 | (0.15) | -0.68 | (0.23) | 0.25 | (0.11) | 1.14 | (0.10) |
| Campeche | -1.01 | (0.14) | -2.37 | (0.25) | -1.31 | (0.21) | -0.62 | (0.18) | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.08 | (0.10) |
| Chiapas | -1.44 | (0.17) | -2.83 | (0.21) | -1.75 | (0.27) | -0.95 | (0.20) | -0.23 | (0.22) | 1.04 | (0.11) |
| Chihuahua | -1.14 | (0.17) | -2.26 | (0.13) | -1.57 | (0.28) | -0.91 | (0.25) | 0.20 | (0.23) | 1.00 | (0.10) |
| Coahuila | -0.98 | (0.17) | -2.37 | (0.31) | -1.26 | (0.22) | -0.72 | (0.15) | 0.43 | (0.28) | 1.12 | (0.15) |
| Colima | -0.31 | (0.14) | -1.75 | (0.24) | -0.62 | (0.21) | -0.12 | (0.07) | 1.24 | (0.19) | 1.18 | (0.10) |
| Distrito Federal | -0.42 | (0.16) | -1.72 | (0.27) | -0.94 | (0.20) | -0.03 | (0.31) | 1.02 | (0.11) | 1.12 | (0.11) |
| Durango | -0.96 | (0.09) | -1.86 | (0.14) | -1.34 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.18) | 0.24 | (0.20) | 0.91 | (0.11) |
| Guanajuato | -1.03 | (0.17) | -2.70 | (0.36) | -1.38 | (0.13) | -0.59 | (0.25) | 0.56 | (0.27) | 1.30 | (0.15) |
| Guerrero | -1.00 | (0.12) | -2.47 | (0.25) | -1.23 | (0.15) | -0.56 | (0.22) | 0.28 | (0.17) | 1.08 | (0.13) |
| Hidalgo | -0.95 | (0.14) | -2.49 | (0.29) | -1.17 | (0.22) | -0.56 | (0.14) | 0.45 | (0.12) | 1.17 | (0.12) |
| Jalisco | -0.74 | (0.19) | -2.27 | (0.25) | -1.03 | (0.30) | -0.39 | (0.22) | 0.73 | (0.28) | 1.17 | (0.14) |
| Mexico | -0.52 | (0.17) | -1.61 | (0.22) | -0.81 | (0.16) | -0.23 | (0.17) | 0.58 | (0.35) | 0.92 | (0.15) |
| Morelos | -0.82 | (0.16) | -2.26 | (0.24) | -1.26 | (0.20) | -0.39 | (0.19) | 0.63 | (0.23) | 1.11 | (0.11) |
| Nayarit | -1.29 | (0.16) | -2.52 | (0.13) | -1.75 | (0.20) | -1.04 | (0.14) | 0.13 | (0.33) | 1.07 | (0.14) |
| Nuevo León | -0.04 | (0.26) | -1.56 | (0.40) | -0.40 | (0.16) | 0.11 | (0.35) | 1.71 | (0.36) | 1.27 | (0.16) |
| Puebla | -1.11 | (0.10) | -1.96 | (0.08) | -1.61 | (0.08) | -1.08 | (0.14) | 0.20 | (0.27) | 0.94 | (0.13) |
| Querétaro | -0.93 | (0.16) | -2.17 | (0.22) | -1.18 | (0.33) | -0.77 | (0.11) | 0.39 | (0.34) | 1.02 | (0.14) |
| Quintana Roo | -0.86 | (0.14) | -1.96 | (0.18) | -1.26 | (0.15) | -0.61 | (0.17) | 0.41 | (0.21) | 0.98 | (0.07) |
| San Luis Potosí | -1.07 | (0.17) | -2.28 | (0.20) | -1.35 | (0.26) | -0.78 | (0.11) | 0.15 | (0.30) | 0.99 | (0.11) |
| Sinaloa | -0.48 | (0.11) | -1.36 | (0.15) | -0.74 | (0.15) | -0.21 | (0.13) | 0.38 | (0.15) | 0.69 | (0.07) |
| Tabasco | -1.24 | (0.16) | -2.40 | (0.23) | -1.60 | (0.14) | -1.04 | (0.15) | 0.09 | (0.33) | 1.02 | (0.14) |
| Tamaulipas | -0.51 | (0.19) | -1.85 | (0.18) | -1.02 | (0.36) | -0.25 | (0.15) | 1.09 | (0.34) | 1.16 | (0.14) |
| Tlaxcala | -0.71 | (0.13) | -2.11 | (0.21) | -0.98 | (0.17) | -0.28 | (0.12) | 0.54 | (0.24) | 1.07 | (0.13) |
| Veracruz | -1.04 | (0.18) | -2.24 | (0.15) | -1.57 | (0.14) | -0.67 | (0.32) | 0.33 | (0.24) | 1.03 | (0.10) |
| Yucatán | -1.10 | (0.16) | -2.13 | (0.18) | -1.40 | (0.15) | -0.93 | (0.14) | 0.07 | (0.43) | 0.96 | (0.20) |
| Zacatecas | -1.38 | (0.19) | -2.90 | (0.28) | -1.74 | (0.20) | -1.11 | (0.26) | 0.24 | (0.30) | 1.24 | (0.14) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.16 for national data.
StatLink (-nilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of quality of schools' educational resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| P Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 0.30 | (0.23) | -0.69 | (0.12) | -0.06 | (0.25) | 0.55 | (0.28) | 1.41 | (0.46) | 0.85 | (0.15) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.10 | (0.11) | -0.69 | (0.11) | -0.14 | (0.10) | 0.19 | (0.12) | 1.03 | (0.22) | 0.69 | (0.09) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.24 | (0.15) | -0.94 | (0.16) | -0.13 | (0.20) | 0.40 | (0.17) | 1.65 | (0.19) | 0.99 | (0.07) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.28 | (0.13) | -0.65 | (0.09) | -0.12 | (0.15) | 0.47 | (0.15) | 1.43 | (0.25) | 0.84 | (0.08) |
| Balearic Islands* | -0.24 | (0.11) | -1.18 | (0.30) | -0.45 | (0.08) | -0.14 | (0.09) | 0.82 | (0.19) | 0.86 | (0.17) |
| Basque Country* | 0.14 | (0.07) | -0.98 | (0.15) | -0.20 | (0.06) | 0.37 | (0.07) | 1.38 | (0.12) | 0.97 | (0.09) |
| Cantabria* | 0.15 | (0.12) | -0.83 | (0.08) | -0.20 | (0.16) | 0.29 | (0.12) | 1.36 | (0.23) | 0.87 | (0.07) |
| Castile and Leon* | -0.26 | (0.11) | -1.30 | (0.10) | -0.70 | (0.10) | -0.09 | (0.18) | 1.07 | (0.24) | 0.95 | (0.10) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.09 | (0.14) | -1.05 | (0.17) | -0.27 | (0.13) | 0.30 | (0.15) | 1.38 | (0.28) | 0.96 | (0.10) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 0.52 | (0.17) | -0.91 | (0.28) | 0.19 | (0.22) | 0.93 | (0.19) | 1.88 | (0.17) | 1.10 | (0.11) |
| Galicia• | -0.12 | (0.12) | -0.99 | (0.12) | -0.37 | (0.08) | -0.04 | (0.08) | 0.91 | (0.29) | 0.78 | (0.10) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.46 | (0.01) | -0.62 | (0.01) | -0.03 | (0.01) | 0.66 | (0.01) | 1.82 | (0.01) | 0.95 | (0.01) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.02 | (0.13) | -0.93 | (0.16) | -0.26 | (0.07) | 0.15 | (0.14) | 1.14 | (0.26) | 0.83 | (0.09) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.04 | (0.12) | -1.00 | (0.11) | -0.48 | (0.07) | 0.12 | (0.21) | 1.21 | (0.22) | 0.88 | (0.08) |
| Navarre* | -0.04 | (0.06) | -0.93 | (0.09) | -0.34 | (0.06) | 0.14 | (0.10) | 0.97 | (0.09) | 0.75 | (0.04) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 0.55 | (0.09) | -0.68 | (0.09) | 0.03 | (0.06) | 0.89 | (0.24) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.05 | (0.03) |
| Northern Ireland | -0.01 | (0.10) | -1.14 | (0.12) | -0.32 | (0.08) | 0.15 | (0.10) | 1.29 | (0.22) | 0.97 | (0.08) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.56 | (0.10) | -0.79 | (0.11) | 0.13 | (0.13) | 0.92 | (0.23) | 1.98 | (0.01) | 1.07 | (0.05) |
| Wales | 0.14 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.10) | -0.29 | (0.07) | 0.29 | (0.09) | 1.64 | (0.15) | 1.06 | (0.06) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 0.76 | (0.18) | -0.58 | (0.15) | 0.07 | (0.20) | 1.59 | (0.43) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.05) |
| Florida• | 0.09 | (0.17) | -1.00 | (0.20) | -0.31 | (0.12) | 0.16 | (0.23) | 1.51 | (0.27) | 0.99 | (0.10) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.33 | (0.17) | -1.08 | (0.13) | -0.41 | (0.24) | 0.84 | (0.37) | 1.98 | (0.09) | 1.21 | (0.06) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.38 | (0.17) | -1.47 | (0.24) | -0.31 | (0.25) | 1.32 | (0.39) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.45 | (0.12) |
| \% Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | -1.08 | (0.11) | -1.84 | (0.11) | -1.29 | (0.18) | -0.85 | (0.14) | -0.33 | (0.17) | 0.59 | (0.07) |
| Alagoas | -0.93 | (0.23) | -2.16 | (0.35) | -1.20 | (0.21) | -0.83 | (0.21) | 0.48 | (0.52) | 1.05 | (0.22) |
| Amapá | -0.82 | (0.08) | -1.56 | (0.07) | -1.27 | (0.09) | -0.86 | (0.15) | 0.41 | (0.25) | 0.91 | (0.16) |
| Amazonas | -0.95 | (0.18) | -1.88 | (0.12) | -1.44 | (0.20) | -0.71 | (0.34) | 0.24 | (0.22) | 0.91 | (0.11) |
| Bahia | -0.44 | (0.24) | -1.68 | (0.41) | -0.72 | (0.17) | c | c | c | c | 1.03 | (0.15) |
| Ceará | -0.36 | (0.13) | -1.57 | (0.36) | -0.60 | (0.18) | -0.13 | (0.12) | 0.89 | (0.11) | 1.03 | (0.14) |
| Espírito Santo | -0.57 | (0.16) | -1.36 | (0.16) | -0.97 | (0.09) | -0.57 | (0.15) | 0.63 | (0.47) | 0.89 | (0.18) |
| Federal District | -0.68 | (0.25) | -2.23 | (0.65) | -1.02 | (0.14) | -0.23 | (0.35) | c | c | 1.26 | (0.24) |
| Goiás | -1.29 | (0.25) | -2.41 | (0.31) | -1.77 | (0.20) | -1.13 | (0.23) | 0.17 | (0.45) | 1.11 | (0.11) |
| Maranhão | -1.21 | (0.13) | -1.96 | (0.14) | -1.44 | (0.21) | -1.01 | (0.19) | -0.42 | (0.23) | 0.69 | (0.15) |
| Mato Grosso | -0.87 | (0.18) | -1.95 | (0.12) | -1.27 | (0.24) | -0.63 | (0.08) | 0.38 | (0.46) | 0.99 | (0.17) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | -0.98 | (0.18) | -1.90 | (0.24) | -1.28 | (0.06) | -0.95 | (0.16) | 0.22 | (0.47) | 0.96 | (0.20) |
| Minas Gerais | -0.76 | (0.12) | -1.96 | (0.18) | -1.06 | (0.15) | -0.58 | (0.20) | 0.56 | (0.16) | 1.01 | (0.09) |
| Pará | -0.74 | (0.18) | -2.01 | (0.05) | -1.55 | (0.31) | -0.80 | (0.10) | 1.41 | (0.48) | 1.38 | (0.17) |
| Paraíba | -0.46 | (0.17) | -1.77 | (0.17) | -0.88 | (0.24) | -0.06 | (0.35) | c | c | 1.05 | (0.15) |
| Paraná | -0.45 | (0.10) | -1.31 | (0.19) | -0.77 | (0.12) | -0.37 | (0.13) | 0.68 | (0.21) | 0.79 | (0.10) |
| Pernambuco | -0.53 | (0.16) | -1.46 | (0.22) | -0.90 | (0.17) | -0.39 | (0.21) | 0.65 | (0.28) | 0.83 | (0.12) |
| Piauí | -0.98 | (0.23) | -2.20 | (0.41) | -1.42 | (0.18) | -0.78 | (0.29) | 0.50 | (0.48) | 1.15 | (0.23) |
| Rio de Janeiro | -0.22 | (0.14) | -1.11 | (0.15) | -0.57 | (0.18) | -0.01 | (0.18) | 0.80 | (0.23) | 0.75 | (0.08) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | -0.64 | (0.25) | -2.28 | (0.30) | -1.04 | (0.24) | -0.45 | (0.31) | 1.23 | (0.59) | 1.39 | (0.21) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | -0.46 | (0.27) | -2.16 | (0.58) | -0.90 | (0.25) | -0.04 | (0.34) | 1.25 | (0.24) | 1.38 | (0.22) |
| Rondônia | -1.18 | (0.10) | -1.97 | (0.22) | -1.42 | (0.07) | -0.98 | (0.12) | -0.35 | (0.18) | 0.67 | (0.10) |
| Roraima | -0.98 | (0.22) | -2.43 | (0.39) | -1.19 | (0.27) | -0.53 | (0.19) | 0.24 | (0.28) | 1.04 | (0.15) |
| Santa Catarina | -0.53 | (0.17) | -1.48 | (0.16) | -0.80 | (0.19) | -0.46 | (0.11) | 0.64 | (0.44) | 0.86 | (0.18) |
| São Paulo | -0.28 | (0.12) | -1.47 | (0.13) | -0.72 | (0.15) | 0.01 | (0.13) | 1.07 | (0.24) | 1.02 | (0.10) |
| Sergipe | -0.90 | (0.18) | -1.98 | (0.30) | -1.00 | (0.22) | -0.50 | (0.26) | -0.13 | (0.08) | 0.73 | (0.09) |
| Tocantins | -0.84 | (0.09) | -1.49 | (0.06) | -1.11 | (0.14) | -0.67 | (0.13) | -0.07 | (0.14) | 0.56 | (0.05) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | -0.94 | (0.12) | -2.37 | (0.22) | -1.11 | (0.17) | -0.59 | (0.14) | 0.31 | (0.16) | 1.07 | (0.11) |
| Cali | -0.70 | (0.23) | -2.68 | (0.23) | -1.43 | (0.32) | -0.13 | (0.37) | 1.44 | (0.26) | 1.60 | (0.13) |
| Manizales | -0.75 | (0.17) | -2.22 | (0.19) | -1.29 | (0.25) | -0.27 | (0.26) | 0.78 | (0.17) | 1.16 | (0.09) |
| Medellin | -0.55 | (0.19) | -2.25 | (0.33) | -1.14 | (0.17) | -0.25 | (0.23) | 1.47 | (0.23) | 1.43 | (0.11) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | -0.53 | (0.13) | -1.78 | (0.23) | -0.72 | (0.18) | -0.22 | (0.11) | 0.60 | (0.19) | 0.98 | (0.12) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 0.25 | (0.09) | -1.28 | (0.09) | -0.40 | (0.10) | 0.70 | (0.23) | 1.98 | (0.03) | 1.28 | (0.04) |
| Ajman | 0.26 | (0.11) | -1.42 | (0.23) | -0.04 | (0.15) | 0.64 | (0.10) | 1.85 | (0.13) | 1.27 | (0.06) |
| Dubai* | 0.61 | (0.01) | -1.04 | (0.00) | 0.30 | (0.01) | 1.21 | (0.01) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 1.17 | (0.00) |
| Fujairah | 0.21 | (0.10) | -0.87 | (0.05) | 0.02 | (0.08) | 0.37 | (0.05) | 1.35 | (0.33) | 0.88 | (0.09) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 0.38 | (0.22) | -1.07 | (0.24) | -0.13 | (0.27) | 0.75 | (0.44) | 1.98 | (0.14) | 1.17 | (0.11) |
| Sharjah | 0.34 | (0.14) | -0.94 | (0.16) | -0.35 | (0.17) | 0.75 | (0.26) | 1.92 | (0.20) | 1.13 | (0.10) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 0.22 | (0.01) | -0.88 | (0.03) | c | c | 0.25 | (0.02) | c | c | 1.06 | (0.01) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.16 for national data.

[Part 3/4]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 510 | (8.9) | 504 | (7.6) | 495 | (7.4) | 554 | (6.7) | 17.2 | (3.5) | 1.2 | (0.20) | 3.5 | (1.42) |
| O New South Wales | 491 | (8.0) | 494 | (7.1) | 527 | (10.2) | 527 | (9.9) | 16.5 | (4.8) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 2.7 | (1.45) |
| Northern territory | 446 | (12.9) | 431 | (42.0) | 447 | (56.9) | 485 | (18.1) | 18.1 | (10.4) | 1.1 | (0.30) | 2.1 | (2.14) |
| Queensland | 478 | (6.9) | 506 | (8.5) | 510 | (7.6) | 521 | (7.7) | 17.5 | (4.6) | 1.6 | (0.20) | 2.7 | (1.47) |
| South Australia | 494 | (9.6) | 478 | (10.8) | 487 | (10.4) | 499 | (10.7) | 6.9 | (5.6) | 1.0 | (0.15) | 0.4 | (0.71) |
| Tasmania | 455 | (6.5) | 471 | (8.6) | 493 | (8.3) | 500 | (6.2) | 18.0 | (4.6) | 1.6 | (0.20) | 2.5 | (1.24) |
| Victoria | 475 | (6.9) | 503 | (10.8) | 508 | (7.1) | 518 | (7.1) | 15.3 | (3.9) | 1.7 | (0.24) | 2.7 | (1.32) |
| Western Australia | 490 | (7.1) | 504 | (10.2) | 529 | (8.4) | 542 | (9.2) | 20.6 | (4.2) | 1.6 | (0.23) | 4.9 | (1.90) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 521 | (12.2) | 534 | (10.0) | 539 | (11.1) | 536 | (12.2) | 8.4 | (8.8) | 1.2 | (0.23) | 0.5 | (1.13) |
| French community | 490 | (8.0) | 495 | (7.4) | 526 | (10.6) | 527 | (9.7) | 16.5 | (4.8) | 1.3 | (0.15) | 2.7 | (1.45) |
| German-speaking community | 475 | (6.9) | 504 | (11.0) | 508 | (7.2) | 517 | (7.5) | 15.3 | (3.9) | 1.7 | (0.23) | 2.7 | (1.32) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 523 | (12.3) | 514 | (8.3) | 513 | (10.0) | 520 | (6.3) | 1.5 | (5.1) | 1.0 | (0.21) | 0.0 | (0.23) |
| British Columbia | 515 | (7.6) | 519 | (11.9) | 528 | (9.8) | 526 | (8.6) | 3.0 | (4.3) | 1.1 | (0.15) | 0.1 | (0.50) |
| Manitoba | 489 | (7.1) | 497 | (7.8) | 493 | (7.1) | 492 | (10.3) | 2.8 | (5.4) | 1.0 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.36) |
| New Brunswick | 494 | (5.3) | 503 | (4.8) | 510 | (5.6) | 501 | (7.8) | 3.3 | (3.7) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 0.1 | (0.26) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 499 | (11.1) | 503 | (6.6) | 482 | (9.9) | 476 | (17.0) | -9.6 | (9.2) | 0.8 | (0.27) | 1.1 | (2.19) |
| Nova Scotia | 486 | (21.2) | 507 | (13.6) | 505 | (6.9) | 490 | (7.2) | -1.9 | (4.5) | 1.1 | (0.20) | 0.1 | (0.40) |
| Ontario | 508 | (8.4) | 515 | (9.2) | 517 | (7.7) | 518 | (7.5) | 4.6 | (4.1) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.3 | (0.54) |
| Prince Edward Island | 490 | (4.9) | 481 | (5.4) | 486 | (5.6) | 468 | (5.3) | -23.1 | (6.6) | 0.9 | (0.12) | 1.2 | (0.71) |
| Quebec | 520 | (6.9) | 543 | (8.5) | 545 | (9.5) | 535 | (8.9) | 6.1 | (4.8) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 0.4 | (0.54) |
| Saskatchewan | 508 | (5.6) | 509 | (7.1) | 510 | (7.8) | 498 | (7.1) | -4.1 | (3.1) | 0.9 | (0.12) | 0.2 | (0.28) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 426 | (17.2) | 483 | (25.1) | 499 | (10.0) | 494 | (13.2) | 25.7 | (7.8) | 2.4 | (0.61) | 6.5 | (3.24) |
| Basilicata | 452 | (9.3) | 448 | (11.9) | 501 | (14.9) | 457 | (18.2) | 3.7 | (7.5) | 1.2 | (0.28) | 0.2 | (0.99) |
| Bolzano | 500 | (4.3) | 498 | (4.3) | 511 | (4.2) | 522 | (5.6) | 13.4 | (3.3) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 1.8 | (0.85) |
| Calabria | 405 | (19.1) | 433 | (21.2) | 440 | (16.2) | 447 | (15.9) | 16.6 | (10.3) | 1.8 | (0.45) | 2.6 | (2.70) |
| Campania | 416 | (16.3) | 448 | (20.6) | 490 | (15.7) | 469 | (11.0) | 21.7 | (8.8) | 2.0 | (0.56) | 4.3 | (3.38) |
| Emilia Romagna | 446 | (19.5) | 492 | (14.9) | 537 | (20.9) | 542 | (9.2) | 36.5 | (6.7) | 3.0 | (0.76) | 12.6 | (4.00) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 509 | (15.1) | 509 | (10.2) | 521 | (21.3) | 540 | (8.9) | 15.3 | (8.3) | 1.3 | (0.44) | 1.8 | (2.12) |
| Lazio | 451 | (15.9) | 479 | (23.6) | 482 | (19.1) | 504 | (17.4) | 9.9 | (13.3) | 1.5 | (0.43) | 1.1 | (2.89) |
| Liguria | 504 | (14.0) | 470 | (22.7) | 501 | (15.4) | 477 | (13.8) | -5.5 | (8.0) | 0.9 | (0.31) | 0.3 | (0.81) |
| Lombardia | 525 | (14.0) | 526 | (21.8) | 518 | (25.0) | 512 | (22.5) | -4.2 | (9.2) | 0.8 | (0.31) | 0.2 | (1.33) |
| Marche | 510 | (12.3) | 507 | (12.9) | 480 | (23.5) | 501 | (11.6) | -4.2 | (9.4) | 0.9 | (0.29) | 0.1 | (0.46) |
| Molise | 432 | (5.8) | 462 | (4.8) | 453 | (4.6) | 487 | (7.2) | 17.2 | (3.6) | 1.7 | (0.25) | 3.0 | (1.16) |
| Piemonte | 508 | (12.6) | 498 | (12.6) | 489 | (17.6) | 498 | (12.6) | -5.2 | (10.1) | 0.7 | (0.19) | 0.2 | (0.79) |
| Puglia | 471 | (9.6) | 487 | (18.4) | 474 | (20.5) | 490 | (22.4) | 11.7 | (8.6) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 1.4 | (2.17) |
| Sardegna | 440 | (21.2) | 456 | (18.2) | 475 | (13.9) | 468 | (9.5) | 16.5 | (6.0) | 1.6 | (0.49) | 3.8 | (3.19) |
| Sicilia | 458 | (13.4) | 435 | (12.1) | 468 | (15.8) | 430 | (10.5) | -10.2 | (7.5) | 0.8 | (0.21) | 1.1 | (1.59) |
| Toscana | 509 | (23.3) | 503 | (25.8) | 504 | (23.9) | 472 | (29.8) | -2.9 | (15.4) | 0.8 | (0.29) | 0.0 | (1.03) |
| Trento | 508 | (14.4) | 516 | (13.5) | 540 | (10.3) | 541 | (10.2) | 15.2 | (7.7) | 1.5 | (0.37) | 2.7 | (2.74) |
| Umbria | 501 | (7.4) | 493 | (13.8) | 503 | (15.4) | 468 | (24.9) | -11.2 | (10.3) | 0.8 | (0.25) | 1.3 | (2.29) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 510 | (7.1) | 504 | (8.2) | 474 | (8.5) | 486 | (7.1) | -5.3 | (3.3) | 0.9 | (0.16) | 0.3 | (0.33) |
| Veneto | 523 | (20.1) | 533 | (20.6) | 509 | (17.5) | 527 | (17.4) | 2.9 | (11.7) | 1.1 | (0.42) | 0.1 | (1.55) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 426 | (8.9) | 419 | (16.0) | 430 | (10.3) | 473 | (9.7) | 16.1 | (4.2) | 1.2 | (0.29) | 4.9 | (2.49) |
| Baja California | 389 | (8.2) | 403 | (12.6) | 430 | (10.7) | 439 | (16.6) | 14.9 | (5.3) | 1.8 | (0.45) | 5.1 | (2.93) |
| Baja California Sur | 412 | (20.5) | 421 | (16.1) | 408 | (12.3) | 415 | (12.2) | 4.8 | (5.2) | 1.1 | (0.26) | 0.6 | (1.27) |
| Campeche | 374 | (11.9) | 390 | (11.5) | 394 | (7.5) | 424 | (7.4) | 16.8 | (5.0) | 1.8 | (0.39) | 6.6 | (3.85) |
| Chiapas | 349 | (14.7) | 366 | (20.9) | 396 | (20.2) | 381 | (16.5) | 11.1 | (6.5) | 1.6 | (0.44) | 2.4 | (2.78) |
| Chihuahua | 400 | (17.3) | 424 | (18.3) | 440 | (14.5) | 449 | (12.8) | 20.2 | (9.5) | 1.7 | (0.46) | 6.7 | (5.86) |
| Coahuila | 400 | (20.9) | 413 | (16.2) | 417 | (11.6) | 442 | (19.1) | 13.9 | (7.7) | 1.5 | (0.41) | 4.7 | (5.24) |
| Colima | 386 | (14.9) | 417 | (15.0) | 448 | (11.8) | 466 | (12.1) | 24.8 | (5.7) | 2.6 | (0.52) | 14.6 | (6.35) |
| Distrito Federal | 405 | (11.2) | 418 | (10.8) | 437 | (14.8) | 452 | (19.3) | 16.2 | (6.3) | 1.6 | (0.54) | 6.2 | (5.42) |
| Durango | 397 | (11.2) | 415 | (21.2) | 430 | (10.4) | 456 | (10.5) | 22.1 | (5.9) | 1.8 | (0.45) | 7.7 | (3.88) |
| Guanajuato | 364 | (11.3) | 405 | (17.2) | 446 | (10.1) | 432 | (10.6) | 19.9 | (4.2) | 3.0 | (0.79) | 11.9 | (4.32) |
| Guerrero | 358 | (7.3) | 371 | (12.9) | 376 | (14.6) | 367 | (15.7) | 3.4 | (4.1) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 0.3 | (0.92) |
| Hidalgo | 370 | (12.2) | 403 | (14.0) | 424 | (18.0) | 429 | (10.3) | 16.9 | (6.7) | 2.2 | (0.53) | 7.2 | (4.42) |
| Jalisco | 428 | (11.1) | 432 | (18.9) | 434 | (13.4) | 445 | (14.0) | 4.6 | (5.4) | 1.1 | (0.26) | 0.6 | (1.35) |
| Mexico | 406 | (10.6) | 409 | (8.2) | 408 | (14.5) | 446 | (14.9) | 19.8 | (7.0) | 1.4 | (0.42) | 7.4 | (5.71) |
| Morelos | 405 | (13.6) | 395 | (23.0) | 426 | (18.9) | 460 | (21.4) | 20.0 | (8.4) | 1.5 | (0.46) | 8.0 | (6.00) |
| Nayarit | 410 | (14.2) | 398 | (17.4) | 417 | (9.2) | 435 | (9.5) | 15.1 | (5.0) | 1.1 | (0.30) | 4.5 | (3.25) |
| Nuevo León | 413 | (15.3) | 415 | (18.3) | 454 | (11.5) | 463 | (12.7) | 15.6 | (4.8) | 1.6 | (0.36) | 7.2 | (4.10) |
| Puebla | 393 | (11.0) | 395 | (13.8) | 412 | (11.0) | 462 | (6.9) | 28.0 | (5.1) | 1.7 | (0.43) | 12.8 | (3.26) |
| Querétaro | 403 | (10.2) | 429 | (23.7) | 452 | (14.1) | 455 | (11.1) | 18.1 | (6.0) | 1.8 | (0.41) | 6.1 | (3.65) |
| Quintana Roo | 383 | (14.9) | 396 | (10.3) | 428 | (9.2) | 436 | (10.0) | 23.0 | (4.1) | 1.8 | (0.48) | 10.1 | (3.25) |
| San Luis Potosí | 385 | (12.9) | 403 | (14.4) | 416 | (13.5) | 444 | (15.8) | 25.3 | (6.0) | 1.8 | (0.43) | 11.1 | (5.65) |
| Sinaloa | 405 | (10.1) | 410 | (14.6) | 418 | (13.8) | 415 | (14.9) | 7.2 | (9.7) | 1.1 | (0.25) | 0.5 | (1.56) |
| Tabasco | 346 | (10.0) | 360 | (10.6) | 393 | (13.5) | 414 | (12.5) | 20.6 | (3.8) | 2.0 | (0.57) | 8.8 | (3.07) |
| Tamaulipas | 410 | (23.5) | 402 | (13.8) | 396 | (13.8) | 437 | (15.0) | 10.5 | (7.2) | 1.2 | (0.33) | 2.7 | (3.71) |
| Tlaxcala | 397 | (16.3) | 418 | (13.5) | 417 | (8.6) | 412 | (14.9) | 9.2 | (6.9) | 1.5 | (0.43) | 1.9 | (2.89) |
| Veracruz | 398 | (9.7) | 390 | (14.0) | 411 | (19.9) | 410 | (25.6) | 8.9 | (9.3) | 0.8 | (0.21) | 1.5 | (3.41) |
| Yucatán | 370 | (8.9) | 412 | (10.4) | 429 | (10.1) | 429 | (11.6) | 23.9 | (4.9) | 2.2 | (0.37) | 9.5 | (3.28) |
| Zacatecas | 404 | (7.9) | 411 | (13.3) | 402 | (11.6) | 419 | (10.8) | 4.6 | (4.0) | 1.1 | (0.23) | 0.6 | (0.80) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
see Table IV.3.16 for national data.
StatLink 可ilा
[Part 4/4]
Index of quality of schools' educational resources and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV.9 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 488 | (15.9) | 493 | (28.8) | 475 | (29.8) | 508 | (23.3) | 7.8 | (13.5) | 0.9 | (0.35) | 0.6 | (2.23) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 468 | (9.1) | 475 | (11.4) | 472 | (10.7) | 473 | (8.7) | 1.7 | (5.6) | 1.1 | (0.18) | 0.0 | (0.22) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 503 | (11.1) | 499 | (16.2) | 497 | (13.8) | 486 | (10.7) | -5.0 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.17) | 0.3 | (0.54) |
| Asturias* | 490 | (14.4) | 486 | (12.0) | 507 | (10.7) | 515 | (8.8) | 15.0 | (7.4) | 1.2 | (0.26) | 1.8 | (1.98) |
| Balearic Islands* | 471 | (8.2) | 467 | (9.0) | 459 | (10.9) | 503 | (8.4) | 12.8 | (5.5) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 1.6 | (1.08) |
| Basque Country* | 512 | (5.5) | 494 | (7.5) | 508 | (5.2) | 508 | (6.3) | -2.3 | (3.1) | 0.9 | (0.09) | 0.1 | (0.23) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 496 | (8.5) | 488 | (9.3) | 488 | (8.4) | 493 | (10.9) | 0.8 | (7.2) | 0.9 | (0.19) | 0.0 | (0.41) |
| Castile and Leon* | 501 | (12.1) | 517 | (9.5) | 517 | (8.7) | 501 | (8.4) | -1.6 | (6.4) | 1.3 | (0.24) | 0.0 | (0.49) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 472 | (14.4) | 493 | (15.7) | 506 | (9.0) | 502 | (13.2) | 9.7 | (7.0) | 1.6 | (0.34) | 1.2 | (1.67) |
| Extremadura* | 476 | (11.6) | 461 | (10.9) | 459 | (11.5) | 451 | (9.6) | -6.0 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.5 | (0.76) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 491 | (10.6) | 491 | (11.5) | 493 | (9.0) | 481 | (10.3) | -7.5 | (7.1) | 1.0 | (0.20) | 0.5 | (0.92) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 503 | (6.1) | 490 | (6.8) | 512 | (4.8) | 509 | (5.1) | 5.6 | (2.6) | 0.9 | (0.11) | 0.3 | (0.28) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 507 | (8.6) | 490 | (10.8) | 504 | (14.2) | 515 | (15.1) | 5.3 | (7.8) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.3 | (0.78) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 454 | (8.4) | 450 | (10.6) | 468 | (15.1) | 474 | (11.1) | 6.1 | (6.2) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 0.4 | (0.75) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 512 | (5.3) | 516 | (8.9) | 522 | (8.3) | 516 | (6.0) | 4.3 | (3.5) | 1.1 | (0.12) | 0.1 | (0.23) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 495 | (8.3) | 500 | (7.1) | 489 | (7.8) | 504 | (13.8) | 2.8 | (6.7) | 1.0 | (0.17) | 0.1 | (0.57) |
| Northern Ireland | 471 | (9.0) | 491 | (13.9) | 485 | (13.2) | 488 | (13.7) | 8.0 | (6.5) | 1.2 | (0.19) | 0.7 | (1.23) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 500 | (6.2) | 501 | (6.0) | 487 | (8.5) | 503 | (6.9) | -0.7 | (3.3) | 0.9 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.17) |
| Wales | 464 | (5.5) | 467 | (7.3) | 483 | (5.9) | 462 | (5.7) | 0.1 | (2.8) | 1.1 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.11) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 480 | (9.7) | 491 | (13.9) | 521 | (15.2) | 531 | (10.5) | 20.9 | (5.5) | 1.6 | (0.28) | 5.5 | (3.00) |
| Florida• | 476 | (15.9) | 474 | (15.4) | 457 | (15.1) | 471 | (15.0) | -1.0 | (6.8) | 0.8 | (0.19) | 0.0 | (0.47) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 505 | (12.3) | 496 | (18.2) | 531 | (18.9) | 522 | (15.8) | 7.5 | (6.5) | 1.0 | (0.23) | 0.9 | (1.47) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 341 | (24.0) | 411 | (12.9) | 455 | (12.4) | 463 | (11.1) | 35.9 | (6.5) | 3.9 | (0.98) | 29.4 | (9.73) |
| \% Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 360 | (11.8) | 358 | (10.8) | 349 | (12.2) | 368 | (19.0) | 3.3 | (9.8) | 0.9 | (0.25) | 0.1 | (0.91) |
| Alagoas | 328 | (18.6) | 333 | (20.7) | 323 | (17.0) | 387 | (22.2) | 19.7 | (7.5) | 1.1 | (0.35) | 8.7 | (4.97) |
| Amapá | 341 | (10.0) | 373 | (19.9) | 340 | (20.9) | 387 | (17.1) | 17.2 | (12.7) | 1.5 | (0.50) | 5.9 | (6.46) |
| Amazonas | 351 | (9.7) | 357 | (10.7) | 350 | (14.5) | 365 | (18.5) | 15.8 | (11.6) | 1.1 | (0.32) | 4.9 | (7.10) |
| Bahia | 345 | (16.8) | 353 | (23.0) | c | c | c | c | 28.8 | (11.6) | 1.6 | (0.73) | 13.8 | (7.65) |
| Ceará | 353 | (12.8) | 388 | (23.4) | 386 | (22.1) | 386 | (21.3) | 18.8 | (10.0) | 1.6 | (0.55) | 5.9 | (6.30) |
| Espírito Santo | 383 | (12.5) | 409 | (20.3) | 394 | (16.9) | 471 | (19.4) | 31.8 | (14.7) | 1.6 | (0.51) | 10.9 | (9.89) |
| Federal District | 388 | (26.0) | 383 | (19.6) | 389 | (24.9) | c | c | 20.2 | (12.7) | 1.5 | (0.78) | 9.5 | (9.15) |
| Goiás | 366 | (15.5) | 365 | (9.5) | 361 | (14.9) | 424 | (16.9) | 25.2 | (7.6) | 1.2 | (0.53) | 15.4 | (10.25) |
| Maranhão | 337 | (17.9) | 334 | (32.1) | 341 | (37.3) | 361 | (36.8) | 5.7 | (18.4) | 1.1 | (0.49) | 0.3 | (2.63) |
| Mato Grosso | 342 | (14.4) | 366 | (8.9) | 368 | (12.7) | 405 | (30.6) | 33.3 | (10.3) | 1.7 | (0.57) | 20.2 | (13.76) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 405 | (11.9) | 416 | (21.5) | 385 | (17.2) | 427 | (17.7) | 13.9 | (10.7) | 0.9 | (0.32) | 3.3 | (6.14) |
| Minas Gerais | 388 | (8.8) | 394 | (6.0) | 396 | (19.9) | 435 | (19.9) | 18.6 | (7.4) | 1.3 | (0.29) | 6.8 | (5.39) |
| Pará | 333 | (10.6) | 341 | (9.9) | 358 | (15.1) | 407 | (8.8) | 20.3 | (4.5) | 1.4 | (0.46) | 17.2 | (3.57) |
| Paraíba | 345 | (26.3) | 393 | (15.4) | 395 | (22.5) | c |  | 38.9 | (6.8) | 3.0 | (0.96) | 27.1 | (8.01) |
| Paraná | 406 | (9.7) | 384 | (9.7) | 382 | (16.7) | 442 | (43.9) | 18.4 | (21.2) | 0.6 | (0.14) | 3.2 | (6.48) |
| Pernambuco | 361 | (11.0) | 370 | (14.0) | 362 | (15.1) | 361 | (18.5) | 5.7 | (11.1) | 0.9 | (0.29) | 0.5 | (1.65) |
| Piauí | 361 | (11.3) | 370 | (12.1) | 394 | (49.8) | 416 | (26.9) | 24.5 | (7.0) | 1.2 | (0.48) | 12.0 | (9.57) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 364 | (15.8) | 370 | (7.9) | 394 | (34.5) | 419 | (16.6) | 29.2 | (9.9) | 1.7 | (0.56) | 9.6 | (5.98) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 354 | (7.8) | 348 | (14.5) | 360 | (13.6) | 460 | (36.6) | 31.4 | (8.0) | 1.1 | (0.31) | 27.3 | (12.56) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 372 | (17.8) | 430 | (20.6) | 409 | (12.9) | 417 | (14.2) | 12.9 | (5.1) | 2.2 | (0.57) | 6.9 | (6.34) |
| Rondônia | 380 | (6.9) | 390 | (19.2) | 376 | (9.3) | 383 | (10.7) | 2.4 | (8.9) | 1.1 | (0.29) | 0.1 | (1.05) |
| Roraima | 344 | (9.5) | 340 | (10.8) | 372 | (18.0) | 392 | (30.2) | 21.7 | (8.0) | 1.4 | (0.42) | 9.7 | (7.47) |
| Santa Catarina | 411 | (12.3) | 422 | (24.0) | 380 | (15.9) | 449 | (28.0) | 20.0 | (8.4) | 1.0 | (0.28) | 5.3 | (5.25) |
| São Paulo | 388 | (7.2) | 386 | (7.7) | 402 | (10.4) | 438 | (13.8) | 18.4 | (6.4) | 1.1 | (0.20) | 5.8 | (4.03) |
| Sergipe | 407 | (33.0) | 370 | (15.7) | 388 | (19.9) | 371 | (13.0) | -18.2 | (13.5) | 0.6 | (0.34) | 3.6 | (5.50) |
| Tocantins | 373 | (11.3) | 333 | (8.3) | 355 | (20.5) | 401 | (20.2) | 31.8 | (14.9) | 0.7 | (0.23) | 5.4 | (5.12) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 383 | (6.5) | 387 | (7.3) | 401 | (9.7) | 400 | (10.3) | 3.6 | (4.5) | 1.4 | (0.21) | 0.3 | (0.83) |
| Cali | 383 | (14.1) | 362 | (9.9) | 375 | (15.1) | 398 | (15.5) | 3.5 | (4.3) | 0.7 | (0.24) | 0.6 | (1.65) |
| Manizales | 375 | (5.7) | 382 | (9.3) | 405 | (15.4) | 451 | (15.4) | 23.1 | (4.9) | 1.8 | (0.35) | 13.9 | (4.44) |
| Medellin | 373 | (8.7) | 373 | (13.2) | 390 | (15.3) | 437 | (19.2) | 19.7 | (5.1) | 1.2 | (0.31) | 11.5 | (4.98) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 472 | (11.6) | 479 | (13.2) | 482 | (12.9) | 506 | (20.1) | 9.3 | (7.2) | 1.2 | (0.26) | 1.1 | (1.52) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 404 | (7.9) | 415 | (9.9) | 429 | (10.1) | 441 | (11.3) | 11.3 | (3.9) | 1.3 | (0.21) | 2.8 | (1.82) |
| Ajman | 404 | (22.0) | 389 | (20.4) | 411 | (15.7) | 410 | (8.3) | -0.1 | (4.4) | 1.0 | (0.30) | 0.0 | (0.43) |
| Dubai ${ }^{*}$ | 422 | (2.4) | 474 | (2.8) | 467 | (3.0) | 496 | (3.0) | 24.1 | (1.2) | 2.1 | (0.13) | 9.0 | (0.86) |
| Fujairah | 380 | (6.5) | 422 | (16.5) | 411 | (20.6) | 431 | (25.8) | 23.1 | (10.9) | 1.8 | (0.48) | 6.1 | (6.35) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 397 | (22.2) | 399 | (19.3) | 431 | (12.3) | 435 | (10.2) | 12.6 | (5.2) | 1.6 | (0.71) | 3.9 | (3.31) |
| Sharjah | 416 | (15.2) | 439 | (17.2) | 450 | (18.4) | 451 | (24.2) | 12.8 | (9.2) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 3.0 | (3.97) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 389 | (9.8) | c | c | 379 | (6.1) | c | c | 2.9 | (3.3) | 1.0 | (0.26) | 0.2 | (0.49) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.16 for national data.

[Part 1/4]
Students' learning time in school, by region
Table B2.IV. $10 \quad$ Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Total class periods per week |  |  |  | Regular mathematics lessons |  |  |  | Regular language-of-instruction lessons |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of all class periods in a normal full week of school (class periods) |  | Variability in total class periods |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Custralian capital territory | 28.1 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (0.6) | 219.1 | (2.4) | 51.5 | (2.9) | 217.3 | (2.6) | 48.5 | (3.1) |
| - New South Wales | 28.6 | (0.3) | 8.0 | (0.3) | 233.8 | (1.7) | 58.4 | (1.8) | 231.0 | (1.6) | 56.8 | (1.6) |
| Northern territory | 26.3 | (0.8) | 7.5 | (0.8) | 251.1 | (4.1) | 48.9 | (6.1) | 252.2 | (4.0) | 52.5 | (5.8) |
| Queensland | 24.8 | (0.5) | 8.9 | (0.4) | 227.3 | (3.0) | 61.3 | (4.0) | 222.0 | (2.7) | 50.7 | (4.4) |
| South Australia | 30.4 | (0.6) | 8.0 | (0.5) | 233.2 | (3.5) | 63.0 | (4.5) | 230.9 | (3.5) | 59.3 | (5.0) |
| Tasmania | 26.1 | (0.4) | 8.7 | (0.5) | 245.0 | (3.5) | 79.7 | (4.3) | 237.9 | (2.8) | 78.5 | (3.8) |
| Victoria | 28.2 | (0.5) | 8.1 | (0.4) | 241.9 | (2.5) | 59.0 | (3.0) | 240.7 | (2.6) | 58.7 | (3.0) |
| Western Australia | 27.4 | (0.4) | 7.7 | (0.5) | 248.9 | (2.8) | 58.2 | (3.6) | 245.0 | (2.3) | 46.5 | (3.2) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Flemish community }}{ }^{*}$ | 32.9 | (0.1) | 3.5 | (0.2) | 206.1 | (2.1) | 66.8 | (2.4) | 199.2 | (1.6) | 53.7 | (4.3) |
| French community | 31.4 | (0.2) | 6.3 | (0.3) | 230.7 | (2.2) | 73.0 | (3.9) | 241.2 | (2.1) | 63.0 | (4.0) |
| German-speaking community | 33.3 | (0.2) | 4.7 | (0.4) | 216.6 | (2.9) | 64.1 | (2.0) | 232.6 | (2.5) | 59.0 | (4.1) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 22.5 | (0.5) | 7.3 | (0.5) | 364.3 | (7.9) | 146.1 | (6.3) | 360.0 | (8.1) | 150.7 | (7.4) |
| British Columbia | 20.5 | (0.3) | 5.9 | (0.3) | 294.5 | (11.3) | 131.3 | (3.7) | 292.9 | (10.6) | 131.7 | (3.7) |
| Manitoba | 23.4 | (0.5) | 8.6 | (0.5) | 293.5 | (5.2) | 127.1 | (4.3) | 295.6 | (5.5) | 126.2 | (5.3) |
| New Brunswick | 25.2 | (0.2) | 4.4 | (0.4) | 292.7 | (2.7) | 57.2 | (5.1) | 291.1 | (2.6) | 58.9 | (5.9) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 26.4 | (0.2) | 4.6 | (0.3) | 256.6 | (5.0) | 112.6 | (11.3) | 229.4 | (3.2) | 60.0 | (4.4) |
| Nova Scotia | 23.9 | (0.4) | 5.7 | (0.5) | 321.3 | (6.2) | 89.1 | (5.7) | 293.2 | (7.4) | 112.4 | (4.3) |
| Ontario | 19.7 | (0.2) | 5.7 | (0.2) | 325.4 | (5.0) | 122.9 | (2.7) | 324.6 | (4.9) | 127.3 | (3.3) |
| Prince Edward Island | 20.8 | (0.2) | 5.7 | (0.3) | 338.1 | (4.8) | 121.0 | (4.2) | 347.8 | (3.5) | 106.6 | (4.4) |
| Quebec | 22.1 | (0.2) | 5.4 | (0.3) | 292.9 | (3.7) | 102.7 | (3.1) | 311.8 | (4.5) | 115.8 | (3.8) |
| Saskatchewan | 25.2 | (0.3) | 6.0 | (0.3) | 277.4 | (2.8) | 85.9 | (6.3) | 280.5 | (2.3) | 62.4 | (4.0) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 29.9 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 237.6 | (5.6) | 63.6 | (2.7) | 284.8 | (4.1) | 79.0 | (3.8) |
| Basilicata | 29.9 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 243.3 | (4.0) | 60.5 | (3.2) | 281.4 | (3.2) | 71.8 | (1.7) |
| Bolzano | 35.5 | (0.1) | 2.3 | (0.3) | 188.1 | (2.2) | 60.1 | (2.0) | 217.0 | (1.9) | 58.8 | (2.5) |
| Calabria | 30.2 | (0.3) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 237.4 | (4.4) | 55.1 | (2.4) | 295.9 | (4.0) | 78.9 | (2.7) |
| Campania | 29.6 | (0.1) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 243.2 | (7.0) | 64.3 | (3.8) | 302.4 | (5.0) | 85.9 | (2.6) |
| Emilia Romagna | 30.5 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 225.1 | (4.7) | 54.0 | (2.6) | 271.0 | (4.1) | 76.4 | (4.6) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 31.0 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 227.9 | (3.7) | 56.7 | (2.1) | 267.3 | (5.2) | 75.9 | (3.5) |
| Lazio | 29.8 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 239.2 | (5.4) | 56.6 | (3.2) | 289.4 | (4.8) | 83.7 | (3.2) |
| Liguria | 30.1 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 224.4 | (6.7) | 60.9 | (2.9) | 262.0 | (3.8) | 69.0 | (3.4) |
| Lombardia | 30.0 | (0.1) | 2.7 | (0.1) | 224.9 | (5.4) | 55.8 | (3.1) | 259.0 | (3.9) | 66.2 | (2.9) |
| Marche | 31.2 | (0.3) | 3.4 | (0.2) | 224.8 | (4.7) | 58.5 | (2.2) | 276.9 | (4.9) | 72.7 | (2.6) |
| Molise | 29.9 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 239.7 | (2.1) | 56.7 | (2.3) | 282.0 | (3.0) | 73.8 | (2.5) |
| Piemonte | 30.3 | (0.2) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 231.3 | (5.0) | 61.1 | (4.9) | 273.4 | (4.2) | 78.3 | (4.1) |
| Puglia | 29.6 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 243.8 | (5.2) | 62.8 | (2.5) | 286.1 | (3.6) | 78.6 | (2.7) |
| Sardegna | 29.8 | (0.2) | 3.2 | (0.1) | 241.6 | (5.8) | 67.0 | (3.9) | 276.6 | (4.3) | 78.1 | (3.9) |
| Sicilia | 30.0 | (0.2) | 3.1 | (0.1) | 234.4 | (5.3) | 61.2 | (2.2) | 295.8 | (5.3) | 92.2 | (3.3) |
| Toscana | 30.7 | (0.3) | 3.2 | (0.2) | 235.5 | (4.5) | 56.7 | (2.1) | 274.6 | (6.0) | 79.7 | (3.9) |
| Trento | 33.2 | (0.3) | 2.6 | (0.2) | 205.1 | (2.3) | 50.4 | (1.4) | 252.8 | (5.2) | 74.4 | (3.9) |
| Umbria | 30.0 | (0.2) | 3.3 | (0.1) | 233.6 | (3.8) | 56.7 | (2.9) | 275.8 | (4.2) | 78.1 | (3.6) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 34.5 | (0.1) | 2.9 | (0.1) | 197.6 | (1.8) | 48.5 | (3.1) | 227.2 | (2.5) | 59.4 | (3.2) |
| Veneto | 30.2 | (0.2) | 2.8 | (0.1) | 218.0 | (5.4) | 52.3 | (2.0) | 253.0 | (3.9) | 71.5 | (4.2) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 31.7 | (0.5) | 9.5 | (0.5) | 245.1 | (4.8) | 101.3 | (8.9) | 219.2 | (5.1) | 90.2 | (6.0) |
| Baja California | 31.5 | (1.5) | 10.0 | (1.1) | 260.3 | (5.9) | 108.6 | (18.4) | 240.8 | (4.8) | 98.7 | (9.2) |
| Baja California Sur | 30.3 | (0.7) | 10.3 | (0.7) | 238.9 | (3.5) | 103.5 | (8.2) | 233.3 | (9.4) | 167.9 | (38.6) |
| Campeche | 28.2 | (0.8) | 11.7 | (0.6) | 264.5 | (7.3) | 115.6 | (8.7) | 237.2 | (7.0) | 114.4 | (9.6) |
| Chiapas | 27.8 | (1.0) | 13.2 | (0.6) | 238.1 | (3.5) | 95.3 | (4.7) | 211.6 | (6.0) | 88.5 | (5.2) |
| Chihuahua | 32.0 | (0.6) | 10.4 | (1.5) | 248.2 | (4.9) | 90.3 | (8.9) | 223.9 | (5.0) | 95.0 | (10.9) |
| Coahuila | 31.1 | (1.5) | 12.0 | (0.7) | 250.3 | (9.1) | 124.1 | (15.5) | 229.9 | (9.8) | 112.6 | (10.0) |
| Colima | 29.7 | (0.7) | 12.9 | (0.7) | 262.2 | (5.9) | 105.7 | (6.6) | 226.4 | (3.6) | 93.2 | (5.0) |
| Distrito Federal | 26.6 | (1.4) | 12.7 | (0.8) | 247.9 | (9.8) | 110.0 | (11.2) | 236.6 | (9.1) | 128.6 | (19.1) |
| Durango | 31.7 | (0.6) | 10.7 | (1.0) | 250.5 | (4.6) | 98.8 | (11.7) | 236.8 | (7.3) | 123.0 | (19.2) |
| Guanajuato | 27.3 | (0.8) | 11.6 | (0.6) | 232.1 | (4.9) | 95.6 | (7.3) | 222.5 | (5.5) | 105.0 | (7.4) |
| Guerrero | 27.8 | (1.0) | 14.5 | (2.1) | 250.6 | (6.4) | 134.2 | (9.2) | 235.6 | (7.6) | 157.3 | (22.9) |
| Hidalgo | 26.4 | (1.0) | 10.9 | (0.6) | 254.2 | (8.7) | 110.4 | (8.6) | 227.0 | (7.1) | 119.6 | (12.6) |
| Jalisco | 28.2 | (0.7) | 11.3 | (0.5) | 245.0 | (5.0) | 99.0 | (6.4) | 233.9 | (5.2) | 127.4 | (22.9) |
| Mexico | 30.1 | (0.6) | 11.7 | (0.4) | 275.9 | (6.1) | 132.0 | (10.6) | 266.9 | (8.0) | 157.6 | (25.6) |
| Morelos | 29.8 | (0.9) | 12.1 | (0.9) | 262.1 | (7.1) | 129.1 | (13.7) | 238.0 | (5.5) | 113.4 | (9.2) |
| Nayarit | 29.1 | (0.6) | 10.1 | (0.4) | 252.5 | (5.8) | 119.5 | (9.6) | 227.2 | (7.2) | 140.6 | (14.3) |
| Nuevo León | 33.6 | (0.8) | 10.0 | (0.6) | 244.5 | (7.3) | 127.4 | (14.0) | 212.7 | (6.2) | 104.7 | (15.7) |
| Puebla | 28.7 | (0.5) | 9.6 | (0.5) | 250.2 | (7.4) | 109.9 | (18.3) | 213.3 | (6.0) | 100.3 | (13.2) |
| Querétaro | 32.0 | (0.8) | 10.7 | (1.2) | 262.7 | (6.4) | 98.6 | (11.1) | 243.8 | (5.9) | 86.2 | (8.9) |
| Quintana Roo | 30.4 | (0.8) | 14.5 | (2.0) | 249.5 | (3.7) | 96.4 | (7.0) | 233.2 | (3.9) | 107.8 | (11.3) |
| San Luis Potosí | 30.7 | (1.0) | 10.3 | (0.6) | 247.3 | (4.0) | 84.1 | (6.8) | 223.6 | (5.1) | 87.3 | (6.1) |
| Sinaloa | 29.7 | (0.7) | 8.8 | (0.4) | 235.4 | (4.5) | 97.3 | (12.0) | 210.6 | (5.9) | 106.7 | (19.0) |
| Tabasco | 26.6 | (0.9) | 12.8 | (0.9) | 273.1 | (6.0) | 161.1 | (14.9) | 237.6 | (9.1) | 156.0 | (22.3) |
| Tamaulipas | 29.7 | (0.8) | 10.8 | (0.4) | 241.9 | (5.4) | 94.8 | (8.6) | 227.0 | (6.9) | 115.2 | (16.3) |
| Tlaxcala | 27.5 | (1.0) | 10.8 | (0.4) | 275.9 | (7.2) | 165.6 | (22.9) | 250.6 | (7.0) | 167.5 | (21.2) |
| Veracruz | 29.5 | (0.7) | 11.2 | (1.2) | 255.9 | (9.5) | 127.6 | (11.7) | 225.9 | (6.4) | 101.3 | (10.9) |
| Yucatán | 30.1 | (0.7) | 10.6 | (1.1) | 256.4 | (4.8) | 118.1 | (13.5) | 225.2 | (6.0) | 94.5 | (8.0) |
| Zacatecas | 30.0 | (0.7) | 10.4 | (0.8) | 241.6 | (6.2) | 103.8 | (14.0) | 217.6 | (5.2) | 101.8 | (12.4) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.21 for national data.
StatLink 可istu http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 2/4]
Students' learning time in school, by region
Table B2.IV. 10 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Total class periods per week |  |  |  | Regular mathematics lessons |  |  |  | Regular language-of-instruction lessons |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of all class periods in a normal full week of school (class periods) |  | Variability in total class periods |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 24.8 | (1.1) | 9.6 | (0.4) | 299.9 | (8.7) | 118.0 | (7.9) | 250.7 | (11.1) | 104.7 | (7.7) |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 30.2 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 237.0 | (2.2) | 52.4 | (6.4) | 215.2 | (3.5) | 67.8 | (5.9) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 30.3 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 208.4 | (2.1) | 40.6 | (4.8) | 213.5 | (2.1) | 38.6 | (5.2) |
| Asturias* | 30.4 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 188.3 | (2.1) | 41.8 | (2.6) | 220.9 | (1.1) | 31.3 | (2.0) |
| Balearic Islands* | 32.3 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.0) | 206.8 | (1.2) | 28.7 | (0.9) | 180.1 | (1.5) | 36.0 | (3.8) |
| Basque Country* | 30.8 | (0.1) | 1.5 | (0.1) | 212.5 | (1.3) | 34.3 | (1.0) | 198.4 | (1.4) | 36.1 | (0.9) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 30.3 | (0.1) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 209.4 | (1.8) | 45.2 | (5.4) | 217.4 | (1.7) | 38.7 | (2.7) |
| Castile and Leon* | 30.3 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.2) | 211.7 | (1.5) | 31.0 | (2.6) | 215.8 | (1.4) | 31.6 | (1.7) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.3 | (0.1) | 1.8 | (0.1) | 182.7 | (2.4) | 27.8 | (2.6) | 180.7 | (2.0) | 28.0 | (3.2) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 30.2 | (0.1) | 0.9 | (0.1) | 218.8 | (1.7) | 38.2 | (2.2) | 219.0 | (1.9) | 41.9 | (4.2) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 31.8 | (0.1) | 1.2 | (0.1) | 174.7 | (1.9) | 38.9 | (3.6) | 159.4 | (1.5) | 35.2 | (4.2) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 30.3 | (0.0) | 1.0 | (0.1) | 216.6 | (1.1) | 37.2 | (2.5) | 215.6 | (1.5) | 39.4 | (3.0) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 31.2 | (0.2) | 1.8 | (0.2) | 213.7 | (4.2) | 60.4 | (6.7) | 227.1 | (3.1) | 49.4 | (6.3) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 30.4 | (0.1) | 1.1 | (0.1) | 214.1 | (1.2) | 44.3 | (6.0) | 227.3 | (1.4) | 42.8 | (6.2) |
| Navarre* | 30.5 | (0.1) | 1.3 | (0.1) | 211.7 | (1.4) | 31.0 | (1.4) | 216.1 | (1.8) | 34.2 | (3.3) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 27.2 | (0.4) | 6.3 | (0.4) | 229.8 | (2.6) | 87.0 | (5.5) | 231.9 | (3.0) | 84.8 | (4.7) |
| Northern Ireland | 40.5 | (0.9) | 10.8 | (0.3) | 261.6 | (7.2) | 164.4 | (14.3) | 261.2 | (6.5) | 155.9 | (11.5) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 30.8 | (0.2) | 5.2 | (0.3) | 227.1 | (3.2) | 68.6 | (8.5) | 229.7 | (3.4) | 67.1 | (8.9) |
| Wales | 26.3 | (0.2) | 4.5 | (0.3) | 216.8 | (2.4) | 72.0 | (4.3) | 213.9 | (2.4) | 70.0 | (3.1) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 28.9 | (1.0) | 11.4 | (0.4) | 233.2 | (6.2) | 103.1 | (11.7) | 231.8 | (5.3) | 89.3 | (8.3) |
| Florida• | 25.7 | (1.0) | 13.9 | (0.6) | 251.5 | (7.7) | 126.7 | (7.4) | 250.9 | (6.9) | 161.9 | (20.7) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 27.4 | (0.8) | 10.9 | (0.8) | 292.7 | (15.5) | 164.1 | (22.0) | 287.2 | (14.3) | 163.9 | (21.3) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 23.6 | (1.0) | 10.3 | (0.5) | 327.0 | (14.4) | 183.6 | (8.8) | 300.4 | (13.7) | 175.2 | (9.3) |
| こ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 20.3 | (0.5) | 8.8 | (0.5) | 222.6 | (10.2) | 133.0 | (16.0) | 211.9 | (5.6) | 113.7 | (12.4) |
| Alagoas | 21.2 | (0.8) | 9.4 | (0.5) | 238.1 | (8.9) | 117.2 | (8.5) | 225.8 | (10.9) | 128.4 | (14.2) |
| Amapá | 22.7 | (1.3) | 10.9 | (0.7) | 209.7 | (8.0) | 117.0 | (10.6) | 227.5 | (9.3) | 130.0 | (9.7) |
| Amazonas | 21.6 | (0.7) | 9.3 | (0.6) | 199.7 | (6.9) | 85.3 | (8.1) | 203.3 | (4.9) | 82.5 | (6.4) |
| Bahia | 23.8 | (1.1) | 9.1 | (0.9) | 184.3 | (4.5) | 80.8 | (4.5) | 177.3 | (8.8) | 79.6 | (7.7) |
| Ceará | 22.8 | (1.4) | 10.7 | (1.3) | 239.2 | (10.4) | 130.0 | (7.8) | 224.7 | (9.7) | 124.3 | (6.1) |
| Espírito Santo | 24.8 | (0.5) | 7.4 | (0.5) | 208.7 | (5.8) | 50.7 | (3.1) | 203.4 | (5.7) | 53.6 | (3.7) |
| Federal District | 27.9 | (0.7) | 9.7 | (0.5) | 207.5 | (7.6) | 92.2 | (5.3) | 210.3 | (14.2) | 112.3 | (14.4) |
| Goiás | 25.3 | (0.7) | 10.0 | (0.5) | 199.3 | (5.0) | 66.8 | (3.6) | 194.6 | (6.1) | 79.4 | (6.6) |
| Maranhão | 24.3 | (1.5) | 11.3 | (0.5) | 196.3 | (8.2) | 94.4 | (12.0) | 202.7 | (12.1) | 88.8 | (9.6) |
| Mato Grosso | 19.9 | (1.1) | 8.2 | (0.5) | 216.8 | (9.9) | 136.3 | (17.4) | 223.8 | (8.1) | 131.3 | (12.0) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 23.7 | (0.6) | 7.8 | (0.4) | 179.6 | (5.5) | 75.0 | (5.2) | 180.4 | (7.0) | 86.7 | (7.8) |
| Minas Gerais | 24.4 | (0.6) | 8.3 | (0.7) | 210.3 | (4.9) | 56.9 | (2.8) | 202.2 | (6.8) | 59.6 | (3.5) |
| Pará | 23.2 | (0.8) | 10.5 | (0.4) | 225.7 | (6.6) | 122.6 | (12.2) | 214.2 | (13.1) | 111.6 | (7.9) |
| Paraíba | 28.3 | (0.8) | 8.3 | (0.8) | 211.5 | (5.1) | 64.5 | (5.0) | 206.5 | (2.6) | 72.7 | (4.3) |
| Paraná | 24.3 | (1.0) | 8.6 | (0.7) | 188.4 | (6.6) | 70.0 | (5.6) | 179.7 | (5.3) | 73.9 | (3.5) |
| Pernambuco | 26.2 | (1.3) | 10.0 | (1.2) | 244.1 | (11.1) | 118.7 | (9.5) | 243.0 | (10.1) | 116.9 | (12.7) |
| Piauí | 27.7 | (0.9) | 11.9 | (0.5) | 219.4 | (8.1) | 95.9 | (6.5) | 202.9 | (7.3) | 84.9 | (7.4) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 25.8 | (0.7) | 9.3 | (0.6) | 245.1 | (8.1) | 142.0 | (16.4) | 228.8 | (10.4) | 129.2 | (6.8) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 24.5 | (1.0) | 8.8 | (0.7) | 198.2 | (10.2) | 94.3 | (8.1) | 210.4 | (9.0) | 98.7 | (7.0) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 24.9 | (0.3) | 6.1 | (0.3) | 193.9 | (4.0) | 71.8 | (8.0) | 180.1 | (5.4) | 68.3 | (5.9) |
| Rondônia | 19.8 | (0.9) | 6.5 | (0.8) | 176.7 | (7.5) | 85.3 | (7.0) | 188.5 | (5.1) | 72.9 | (4.0) |
| Roraima | 21.0 | (0.8) | 8.1 | (0.5) | 214.7 | (8.1) | 92.8 | (11.2) | 200.6 | (2.9) | 76.2 | (4.0) |
| Santa Catarina | 24.9 | (0.6) | 8.5 | (0.7) | 163.6 | (7.6) | 86.5 | (23.9) | 148.9 | (4.3) | 61.6 | (10.0) |
| São Paulo | 26.5 | (0.4) | 9.3 | (0.4) | 230.4 | (3.7) | 86.7 | (5.4) | 225.2 | (4.3) | 83.2 | (4.1) |
| Sergipe | 25.8 | (1.2) | 8.9 | (0.5) | 206.2 | (6.7) | 92.0 | (9.3) | 201.0 | (12.1) | 93.4 | (14.6) |
| Tocantins | 22.9 | (0.6) | 9.6 | (0.7) | 213.8 | (3.4) | 79.9 | (2.9) | 221.9 | (5.5) | 77.2 | (4.2) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 21.1 | (0.6) | 9.7 | (0.4) | 283.3 | (14.0) | 162.4 | (10.1) | 235.0 | (9.0) | 120.8 | (4.9) |
| Cali | 22.4 | (0.7) | 10.8 | (0.4) | 265.8 | (11.3) | 153.8 | (8.9) | 234.4 | (6.8) | 129.4 | (5.8) |
| Manizales | 25.5 | (0.5) | 9.3 | (0.3) | 268.9 | (8.1) | 125.2 | (9.7) | 229.7 | (5.4) | 98.8 | (5.8) |
| Medellin | 25.3 | (0.7) | 9.9 | (0.3) | 255.7 | (6.4) | 127.0 | (6.1) | 232.6 | (7.2) | 109.0 | (4.7) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 33.1 | (0.2) | 3.5 | (0.1) | 220.7 | (4.8) | 63.8 | (3.7) | 142.2 | (4.1) | 53.5 | (3.4) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 35.3 | (0.5) | 10.2 | (0.3) | 364.5 | (7.2) | 183.2 | (7.9) | 283.1 | (4.7) | 119.6 | (4.7) |
| Ajman | 32.1 | (0.6) | 8.9 | (0.7) | 268.4 | (3.5) | 75.7 | (5.9) | 285.6 | (3.6) | 76.7 | (4.8) |
| Dubai* | 32.4 | (0.2) | 9.6 | (0.2) | 271.2 | (2.4) | 100.4 | (3.8) | 248.3 | (1.4) | 83.5 | (2.3) |
| Fujairah | 31.3 | (0.8) | 10.3 | (0.5) | 278.8 | (5.2) | 100.2 | (6.0) | 273.6 | (9.4) | 109.3 | (9.8) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 32.2 | (0.6) | 8.7 | (0.5) | 278.5 | (6.2) | 110.7 | (13.0) | 263.9 | (7.2) | 85.1 | (7.3) |
| Sharjah | 31.9 | (0.7) | 9.3 | (0.7) | 291.1 | (8.3) | 107.2 | (17.7) | 270.7 | (6.9) | 86.5 | (7.3) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 30.7 | (0.8) | 9.2 | (0.7) | 273.4 | (4.5) | 76.2 | (5.2) | 273.3 | (5.6) | 79.3 | (6.1) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.21 for national data.
StatLink (nillsta http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 3/4]
Students' learning time in school, by region
Table B2.IV. 10 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Regular science lessons |  |  |  | Regular mathematics, language-of-instruction and science lessons |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 217.9 | (2.8) | 56.3 | (4.1) | 653.0 | (7.5) | 144.2 | (9.1) |
| - New South Wales | 223.6 | (1.7) | 59.6 | (1.9) | 686.0 | (4.6) | 157.8 | (4.6) |
| Northern territory | 243.5 | (6.4) | 72.9 | (6.0) | 736.3 | (12.0) | 134.9 | (18.9) |
| Queensland | 231.5 | (3.1) | 71.2 | (3.1) | 677.4 | (8.3) | 153.8 | (11.9) |
| South Australia | 229.9 | (3.8) | 63.7 | (5.0) | 692.4 | (11.1) | 176.3 | (14.1) |
| Tasmania | 219.7 | (3.7) | 78.7 | (4.9) | 682.9 | (8.4) | 173.8 | (10.6) |
| Victoria | 219.6 | (3.1) | 64.2 | (3.2) | 698.2 | (6.5) | 150.6 | (7.3) |
| Western Australia | 252.4 | (3.7) | 73.6 | (6.1) | 747.0 | (9.1) | 155.9 | (11.2) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 196.6 | (4.2) | 119.3 | (4.2) | 608.2 | (5.4) | 164.7 | (6.4) |
| French community | 187.9 | (3.0) | 97.0 | (4.4) | 661.7 | (5.5) | 174.6 | (7.9) |
| German-speaking community | 162.5 | (4.8) | 113.8 | (15.2) | 617.8 | (6.8) | 164.9 | (10.3) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 365.6 | (8.7) | 149.8 | (5.8) | 1091.1 | (23.8) | 392.5 | (18.6) |
| British Columbia | 295.1 | (10.5) | 136.4 | (4.0) | 882.3 | (32.2) | 369.3 | (11.5) |
| Manitoba | 287.5 | (5.5) | 134.5 | (5.2) | 877.0 | (13.8) | 324.9 | (12.8) |
| New Brunswick | 277.1 | (3.4) | 81.7 | (4.3) | 861.1 | (8.1) | 162.7 | (14.6) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 261.0 | (6.7) | 126.8 | (14.6) | 747.3 | (11.5) | 244.1 | (23.5) |
| Nova Scotia | 277.2 | (15.2) | 130.0 | (4.3) | 889.6 | (27.9) | 275.3 | (10.4) |
| Ontario | 321.2 | (4.7) | 131.2 | (3.3) | 974.6 | (14.1) | 329.3 | (9.0) |
| Prince Edward Island | 338.0 | (4.4) | 120.0 | (4.7) | 1024.7 | (10.8) | 286.9 | (10.4) |
| Quebec | 278.3 | (4.1) | 114.5 | (2.9) | 880.4 | (10.5) | 272.8 | (7.9) |
| Saskatchewan | 242.0 | (4.0) | 97.9 | (3.0) | 798.8 | (6.8) | 182.1 | (7.4) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 127.7 | (1.7) | 41.8 | (3.2) | 649.9 | (7.0) | 121.8 | (6.3) |
| Basilicata | 141.2 | (3.3) | 65.8 | (6.9) | 666.1 | (5.3) | 130.0 | (4.2) |
| Bolzano | 138.6 | (2.9) | 98.3 | (2.6) | 547.8 | (5.4) | 159.2 | (3.7) |
| Calabria | 130.8 | (2.3) | 44.8 | (3.4) | 662.6 | (7.5) | 115.0 | (3.9) |
| Campania | 135.4 | (3.6) | 55.4 | (4.6) | 682.1 | (8.2) | 129.1 | (7.4) |
| Emilia Romagna | 137.7 | (4.6) | 73.1 | (7.3) | 635.6 | (7.0) | 126.6 | (6.8) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 144.4 | (6.2) | 75.9 | (5.3) | 642.2 | (11.7) | 137.1 | (6.9) |
| Lazio | 135.5 | (4.0) | 55.0 | (6.1) | 664.5 | (8.6) | 122.5 | (4.2) |
| Liguria | 128.8 | (3.7) | 58.8 | (5.2) | 615.3 | (10.3) | 121.4 | (6.2) |
| Lombardia | 137.7 | (4.2) | 67.2 | (6.2) | 624.5 | (10.5) | 123.1 | (6.9) |
| Marche | 135.9 | (4.2) | 68.3 | (8.1) | 637.1 | (8.0) | 135.3 | (7.2) |
| Molise | 132.2 | (1.9) | 44.3 | (2.8) | 653.8 | (4.3) | 111.2 | (3.4) |
| Piemonte | 139.0 | (5.7) | 69.0 | (8.9) | 644.6 | (10.4) | 144.0 | (10.6) |
| Puglia | 141.2 | (4.8) | 69.1 | (10.5) | 671.7 | (9.0) | 140.7 | (9.9) |
| Sardegna | 132.5 | (3.1) | 50.8 | (3.9) | 650.8 | (7.4) | 128.3 | (10.2) |
| Sicilia | 129.5 | (3.0) | 47.1 | (3.9) | 659.2 | (6.5) | 127.0 | (4.5) |
| Toscana | 134.4 | (1.9) | 50.0 | (2.8) | 644.0 | (9.9) | 123.7 | (5.8) |
| Trento | 144.9 | (3.8) | 69.8 | (4.0) | 601.3 | (5.6) | 120.8 | (3.6) |
| Umbria | 131.8 | (2.8) | 51.5 | (6.0) | 640.9 | (6.8) | 118.5 | (5.6) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 124.6 | (2.2) | 57.5 | (2.6) | 550.1 | (4.8) | 110.4 | (7.0) |
| Veneto | 131.9 | (5.0) | 62.5 | (4.2) | 606.1 | (10.9) | 126.8 | (6.6) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 238.1 | (5.1) | 131.0 | (17.7) | 701.7 | (11.1) | 265.9 | (27.5) |
| Baja California | 255.5 | (9.7) | 112.4 | (12.9) | 758.8 | (11.1) | 254.8 | (27.4) |
| Baja California Sur | 252.4 | (5.2) | 126.1 | (7.5) | 723.6 | (13.9) | 299.7 | (33.3) |
| Campeche | 270.1 | (10.5) | 159.2 | (18.9) | 770.5 | (19.8) | 297.1 | (22.9) |
| Chiapas | 234.6 | (5.1) | 128.0 | (9.7) | 685.9 | (11.2) | 245.2 | (9.7) |
| Chihuahua | 254.1 | (7.9) | 127.0 | (23.4) | 729.0 | (16.2) | 247.8 | (26.0) |
| Coahuila | 263.6 | (11.9) | 158.6 | (17.6) | 741.5 | (27.2) | 319.6 | (24.5) |
| Colima | 279.7 | (9.0) | 154.8 | (12.3) | 771.8 | (17.6) | 294.0 | (20.5) |
| Distrito Federal | 253.9 | (7.5) | 144.4 | (21.4) | 741.6 | (23.5) | 301.9 | (24.6) |
| Durango | 250.6 | (6.4) | 126.5 | (15.9) | 739.5 | (11.0) | 242.3 | (14.8) |
| Guanajuato | 228.5 | (5.1) | 131.4 | (6.4) | 685.3 | (11.7) | 261.5 | (12.1) |
| Guerrero | 263.6 | (8.1) | 172.2 | (14.9) | 747.4 | (17.9) | 357.5 | (19.1) |
| Hidalgo | 241.3 | (7.8) | 111.2 | (6.3) | 725.7 | (20.5) | 274.9 | (18.9) |
| Jalisco | 281.9 | (9.9) | 161.7 | (19.1) | 755.5 | (13.0) | 289.4 | (16.2) |
| Mexico | 240.0 | (11.6) | 163.7 | (13.3) | 771.2 | (16.6) | 330.7 | (27.1) |
| Morelos | 256.3 | (7.2) | 128.4 | (9.7) | 747.7 | (16.9) | 317.1 | (28.8) |
| Nayarit | 226.5 | (9.2) | 156.7 | (15.9) | 715.6 | (19.6) | 348.8 | (31.6) |
| Nuevo León | 250.5 | (6.5) | 152.6 | (13.5) | 707.1 | (15.5) | 279.1 | (21.2) |
| Puebla | 251.2 | (6.3) | 105.3 | (6.7) | 710.2 | (16.0) | 224.3 | (14.4) |
| Querétaro | 272.0 | (6.8) | 127.9 | (11.7) | 778.6 | (15.6) | 251.8 | (23.8) |
| Quintana Roo | 251.5 | (5.4) | 125.2 | (21.3) | 730.5 | (11.6) | 240.5 | (13.7) |
| San Luis Potosí | 251.6 | (7.0) | 110.5 | (8.0) | 728.1 | (13.5) | 236.8 | (17.9) |
| Sinaloa | 260.7 | (7.2) | 139.4 | (16.1) | 704.5 | (14.4) | 258.5 | (27.0) |
| Tabasco | 274.6 | (11.9) | 202.6 | (29.6) | 778.0 | (24.3) | 384.7 | (21.8) |
| Tamaulipas | 245.5 | (8.3) | 131.6 | (13.7) | 712.3 | (17.0) | 279.7 | (25.1) |
| Tlaxcala | 273.7 | (9.5) | 157.8 | (13.0) | 790.2 | (17.3) | 359.2 | (17.1) |
| Veracruz | 244.8 | (8.7) | 127.1 | (10.2) | 726.9 | (20.4) | 287.5 | (17.6) |
| Yucatán | 267.2 | (7.0) | 136.1 | (12.9) | 749.9 | (13.3) | 265.5 | (11.6) |
| Zacatecas | 246.4 | (5.4) | 124.1 | (14.6) | 709.7 | (13.2) | 251.0 | (21.7) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.21 for national data.
StatLink 可ilा
[Part 4/4]
Students' learning time in school, by region
Table B2.IV. 10 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Regular science lessons |  |  |  | Regular mathematics, language-of-instruction and science lessons |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  | Time per week spent learning (minutes) |  | Variability in learning time |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 248.3 | (13.8) | 207.9 | (17.5) | 813.4 | (26.6) | 333.8 | (19.8) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 206.6 | (4.3) | 109.2 | (6.0) | 663.3 | (8.2) | 175.8 | (20.3) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 168.9 | (3.6) | 87.0 | (4.9) | 590.0 | (6.2) | 131.7 | (17.4) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 180.9 | (4.2) | 84.1 | (2.4) | 590.7 | (5.1) | 111.8 | (4.4) |
| Balearic Islands* | 182.4 | (3.5) | 85.6 | (3.1) | 570.6 | (5.3) | 106.7 | (3.3) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 193.7 | (2.3) | 81.8 | (2.3) | 605.4 | (3.5) | 105.4 | (2.5) |
| Cantabria* | 180.1 | (3.3) | 82.2 | (3.4) | 606.2 | (5.4) | 120.7 | (6.1) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 180.4 | (3.7) | 93.7 | (2.9) | 609.8 | (5.9) | 118.3 | (5.0) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 178.5 | (4.0) | 100.0 | (3.5) | 542.4 | (6.5) | 115.4 | (5.5) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 185.2 | (3.0) | 85.0 | (4.0) | 624.1 | (5.3) | 133.1 | (7.8) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 160.0 | (2.9) | 78.6 | (2.5) | 492.7 | (4.2) | 106.4 | (6.2) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 171.2 | (3.4) | 97.3 | (2.9) | 602.3 | (4.7) | 126.4 | (5.4) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 200.8 | (3.2) | 104.2 | (4.2) | 641.8 | (8.5) | 159.9 | (15.0) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 181.1 | (4.7) | 103.8 | (4.4) | 624.9 | (5.9) | 151.0 | (17.6) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 192.0 | (3.3) | 100.6 | (3.2) | 621.0 | (4.5) | 120.4 | (3.9) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 300.9 | (4.3) | 121.3 | (6.3) | 752.5 | (7.6) | 218.0 | (11.2) |
| Northern Ireland | 321.4 | (6.2) | 198.6 | (8.6) | 809.2 | (13.1) | 379.9 | (20.6) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 232.0 | (4.5) | 135.1 | (5.9) | 678.5 | (7.3) | 197.3 | (16.6) |
| Wales | 279.7 | (3.5) | 112.9 | (4.9) | 706.2 | (7.0) | 202.6 | (10.5) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 255.1 | (6.2) | 144.2 | (25.8) | 716.2 | (14.7) | 248.5 | (18.2) |
| Florida* | 236.4 | (5.0) | 115.2 | (8.1) | 734.9 | (16.9) | 315.6 | (16.3) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 286.2 | (11.2) | 155.3 | (12.8) | 863.3 | (35.3) | 405.6 | (48.1) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 244.6 | (10.8) | 182.6 | (20.5) | 786.5 | (28.5) | 420.1 | (23.1) |
| ๕ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 127.3 | (4.9) | 81.4 | (8.2) | 542.0 | (13.2) | 247.5 | (25.3) |
| Alagoas | 148.8 | (6.9) | 80.0 | (8.1) | 592.6 | (17.5) | 234.2 | (24.4) |
| Amapá | 142.0 | (8.1) | 86.6 | (7.4) | 561.6 | (16.7) | 260.1 | (26.6) |
| Amazonas | 144.1 | (8.3) | 96.5 | (18.4) | 543.2 | (15.8) | 187.6 | (15.6) |
| Bahia | 143.1 | (5.7) | 91.1 | (7.5) | 491.3 | (18.8) | 189.2 | (22.4) |
| Ceará | 166.4 | (14.4) | 135.4 | (22.8) | 621.6 | (31.7) | 291.1 | (20.7) |
| Espírito Santo | 179.7 | (13.0) | 122.3 | (16.8) | 590.9 | (10.9) | 149.8 | (10.6) |
| Federal District | 198.1 | (17.2) | 132.2 | (14.2) | 617.4 | (30.5) | 264.4 | (18.4) |
| Goiás | 155.5 | (7.6) | 100.1 | (10.3) | 544.4 | (13.6) | 177.6 | (12.8) |
| Maranhão | 149.6 | (12.0) | 87.8 | (5.8) | 540.4 | (22.7) | 210.4 | (26.4) |
| Mato Grosso | 150.7 | (11.8) | 102.8 | (13.5) | 576.9 | (25.8) | 284.7 | (21.8) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 160.8 | (10.1) | 107.0 | (15.8) | 519.2 | (18.6) | 204.1 | (9.8) |
| Minas Gerais | 169.9 | (7.9) | 95.7 | (10.4) | 582.4 | (13.1) | 162.9 | (14.4) |
| Pará | 154.3 | (5.1) | 100.3 | (9.6) | 597.2 | (15.7) | 276.1 | (22.2) |
| Paraíba | 176.3 | (4.3) | 103.0 | (7.4) | 595.9 | (9.8) | 185.0 | (9.7) |
| Paraná | 178.7 | (13.8) | 113.4 | (22.2) | 544.0 | (21.4) | 197.1 | (20.2) |
| Pernambuco | 158.7 | (7.9) | 109.5 | (12.4) | 643.7 | (23.8) | 280.6 | (30.1) |
| Piauí | 167.1 | (5.6) | 103.2 | (8.5) | 584.7 | (17.7) | 216.7 | (14.2) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 176.5 | (8.1) | 125.2 | (7.9) | 647.7 | (19.2) | 334.2 | (30.9) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 171.0 | (7.9) | 118.7 | (11.9) | 586.1 | (17.9) | 256.4 | (20.1) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 145.5 | (5.6) | 75.2 | (6.7) | 516.5 | (10.4) | 160.7 | (15.3) |
| Rondônia | 139.1 | (4.4) | 75.3 | (5.3) | 495.1 | (16.2) | 181.6 | (11.8) |
| Roraima | 143.5 | (7.2) | 76.9 | (10.7) | 552.2 | (15.2) | 188.8 | (11.9) |
| Santa Catarina | 126.5 | (8.5) | 76.5 | (12.6) | 435.8 | (15.3) | 154.7 | (16.9) |
| São Paulo | 161.7 | (8.0) | 108.3 | (10.2) | 616.3 | (11.9) | 213.0 | (10.4) |
| Sergipe | 152.4 | (9.4) | 91.1 | (9.7) | 557.9 | (15.3) | 211.8 | (29.1) |
| Tocantins | 141.5 | (5.9) | 91.2 | (8.9) | 575.6 | (11.7) | 203.1 | (12.3) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 209.2 | (8.5) | 137.4 | (7.8) | 725.6 | (28.5) | 344.2 | (18.0) |
| Cali | 196.6 | (9.3) | 132.9 | (8.2) | 689.0 | (25.5) | 357.3 | (24.0) |
| Manizales | 208.1 | (11.1) | 119.3 | (6.9) | 712.8 | (17.6) | 267.5 | (14.7) |
| Medellin | 202.5 | (7.8) | 119.2 | (5.7) | 687.2 | (16.8) | 299.1 | (17.1) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 258.5 | (7.3) | 133.5 | (2.9) | 618.7 | (9.3) | 167.8 | (5.3) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 308.8 | (6.8) | 213.0 | (12.7) | 956.1 | (14.9) | 376.9 | (13.8) |
| Ajman | 270.2 | (13.9) | 183.3 | (37.9) | 823.9 | (15.3) | 243.5 | (29.5) |
| Dubai* | 316.5 | (5.0) | 213.8 | (13.2) | 835.8 | (6.2) | 292.7 | (11.5) |
| Fujairah | 260.9 | (11.8) | 165.8 | (8.0) | 816.0 | (21.6) | 276.8 | (17.3) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 271.3 | (13.2) | 177.8 | (14.5) | 815.2 | (17.5) | 276.9 | (19.9) |
| Sharjah | 324.2 | (12.1) | 219.8 | (16.7) | 879.0 | (18.2) | 278.5 | (16.7) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 252.1 | (12.7) | 158.2 | (17.3) | 809.8 | (15.3) | 215.9 | (11.5) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.21 for national data.
StatLink 可int http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 1/2]
Percentage of students attending after-school lessons (hours per week), by region
Table B2.IV.11 Results based on students' self-reports


- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.25 for national data.

[Part 2/2]
Percentage of students attending after-school lessons (hours per week), by region
Table B2.IV. 11 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  | Language of instruction |  |  |  |  |  | Science |  |  |  |  |  | Other subjects |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Noattendance |  | Less than 4 hours a week |  | 4 hours a week or more |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { No } \\ \text { attendance } \end{array}$ |  | Less than 4 hours a week |  | 4 hours a week or more |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { No } \\ \text { attendance } \end{array}$ |  | Less than 4 hours a week |  | 4 hours a week or more |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { attendance } \end{gathered}\right.$ |  | Less than 4 hours a week |  | 4 hours a week or more |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 50.7 | (4.3) | 36.6 | (3.3) | 12.7 | (2.5) | 61.0 | (3.9) | 29.6 | (3.1) | 9.5 | (2.3) | 71.9 | (2.9) | 24.0 | (3.0) | 4.1 | (1.5) | 58.8 | (2.0) | 35.2 | (1.9) | 6.0 | (1.7) |
| O Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 61.4 | (1.9) | 26.9 | (1.5) | 11.6 | (1.5) | 79.5 | (1.5) | 15.8 | (1.4) | 4.7 | (0.7) | 76.4 | (1.6) | 16.9 | (1.4) | 6.7 | (0.7) | 66.9 | (1.8) | 24.4 | (1.6) | 8.7 | (1.0) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 61.1 | (2.0) | 32.8 | (2.2) | 6.0 | (0.8) | 83.5 | (1.3) | 13.0 | (1.3) | 3.6 | (0.7) | 74.6 | (1.6) | 21.3 | (1.6) | 4.1 | (0.5) | 60.4 | (1.7) | 33.7 | (1.8) | 5.8 | (0.9) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 44.6 | (2.1) | 35.5 | (1.5) | 19.9 | (1.7) | 76.9 | (1.9) | 17.9 | (1.6) | 5.2 | (0.8) | 64.4 | (2.1) | 24.7 | (1.7) | 10.9 | (0.9) | 55.1 | (1.5) | 35.4 | (1.7) | 9.5 | (1.0) |
| Balearic Islands* | 55.2 | (1.9) | 39.4 | (1.9) | 5.4 | (0.9) | 78.3 | (1.8) | 17.7 | (1.6) | 4.0 | (0.6) | 73.6 | (1.4) | 21.8 | (1.5) | 4.5 | (0.7) | 60.2 | (2.3) | 33.5 | (2.1) | 6.3 | (0.8) |
| Basque Country* | 58.2 | (1.4) | 36.0 | (1.3) | 5.8 | (0.5) | 77.5 | (1.0) | 19.6 | (0.9) | 2.8 | (0.3) | 69.8 | (1.2) | 26.2 | (1.2) | 4.0 | (0.4) | 40.1 | (1.1) | 52.4 | (1.1) | 7.5 | (0.5) |
| Cantabria* | 47.3 | (1.8) | 38.2 | (1.4) | 14.5 | (1.0) | 73.2 | (1.8) | 20.0 | (1.4) | 6.8 | (1.0) | 67.2 | (1.6) | 24.7 | (1.3) | 8.1 | (1.0) | 52.0 | (1.9) | 37.6 | (1.7) | 10.4 | (0.9) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 54.4 | (2.0) | 38.3 | (1.7) | 7.3 | (1.2) | 80.8 | (1.4) | 15.2 | (1.3) | 4.0 | (0.7) | 77.4 | (1.5) | 18.7 | (1.3) | 3.8 | (0.7) | 62.2 | (1.6) | 31.3 | (1.6) | 6.5 | (0.9) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 70.1 | (2.1) | 25.9 | (2.1) | 3.9 | (0.7) | 82.2 | (1.5) | 15.8 | (1.3) | 2.0 | (0.6) | 85.1 | (1.5) | 13.0 | (1.3) | 1.9 | (0.5) | 55.8 | (2.4) | 38.5 | (2.2) | 5.7 | (0.6) |
| Extremadura* | 57.9 | (2.2) | 28.9 | (1.8) | 13.2 | (1.2) | 78.0 | (1.8) | 16.2 | (1.5) | 5.8 | (0.8) | 71.4 | (1.7) | 21.2 | (1.3) | 7.4 | (0.9) | 65.4 | (2.0) | 27.1 | (2.1) | 7.5 | (0.8) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 50.1 | (1.8) | 38.0 | (1.7) | 11.9 | (1.1) | 80.4 | (1.7) | 15.4 | (1.5) | 4.2 | (0.8) | 67.6 | (1.8) | 25.1 | (1.8) | 7.3 | (0.9) | 62.0 | (2.0) | 31.0 | (2.0) | 7.0 | (0.9) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 52.9 | (1.7) | 39.8 | (1.5) | 7.3 | (0.9) | 83.4 | (1.2) | 13.3 | (1.1) | 3.3 | (0.5) | 73.5 | (1.5) | 22.8 | (1.5) | 3.8 | (0.6) | 56.9 | (1.8) | 37.4 | (1.6) | 5.7 | (0.9) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 65.7 | (1.7) | 29.7 | (1.4) | 4.6 | (0.7) | 84.5 | (1.6) | 11.8 | (1.3) | 3.7 | (0.6) | 79.4 | (1.5) | 16.5 | (1.2) | 4.0 | (0.6) | 62.9 | (2.1) | 30.3 | (2.1) | 6.8 | (1.0) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 58.2 | (1.8) | 31.7 | (1.7) | 10.1 | (1.4) | 78.0 | (2.1) | 16.7 | (1.9) | 5.2 | (1.0) | 75.2 | (1.7) | 20.2 | (1.4) | 4.6 | (0.8) | 67.9 | (1.9) | 25.6 | (2.2) | 6.5 | (1.0) |
| Navarre* | 59.5 | (1.5) | 35.8 | (1.7) | 4.7 | (0.8) | 81.8 | (1.4) | 15.8 | (1.4) | 2.3 | (0.6) | 77.5 | (1.3) | 19.6 | (1.4) | 3.0 | (0.5) | 55.7 | (1.9) | 38.9 | (1.8) | 5.4 | (0.8) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 58.8 | (1.4) | 32.4 | (1.5) | 8.8 | (0.8) | 66.7 | (1.2) | 24.9 | (1.3) | 8.4 | (0.8) | 65.2 | (1.2) | 24.0 | (1.3) | 10.7 | (0.9) | 49.2 | (1.2) | 37.0 | (1.2) | 13.8 | (0.7) |
| Northern Ireland | 55.2 | (1.7) | 34.8 | (1.4) | 10.0 | (0.9) | 65.0 | (1.7) | 24.8 | (1.5) | 10.2 | (0.9) | 66.4 | (1.3) | 22.6 | (0.9) | 11.0 | (1.0) | 53.8 | (1.5) | 29.6 | (1.2) | 16.6 | (1.2) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 55.7 | (1.3) | 35.2 | (1.3) | 9.1 | (0.6) | 64.8 | (1.3) | 26.1 | (1.3) | 9.1 | (0.6) | 61.3 | (1.3) | 31.8 | (1.2) | 6.9 | (0.6) | 49.1 | (1.3) | 39.5 | (1.2) | 11.4 | (0.7) |
| Wales | 55.3 | (1.3) | 35.2 | (1.1) | 9.5 | (0.7) | 67.3 | (1.1) | 23.3 | (1.0) | 9.4 | (0.7) | 68.6 | (1.0) | 20.5 | (0.9) | 10.9 | (0.7) | 53.9 | (1.0) | 32.5 | (0.9) | 13.5 | (0.7) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 75.1 | (1.3) | 20.4 | (1.1) | 4.5 | (0.6) | 79.1 | (1.1) | 15.5 | (0.9) | 5.4 | (0.6) | 78.6 | (1.1) | 16.1 | (1.1) | 5.4 | (0.7) | 72.4 | (1.2) | 20.1 | (1.1) | 7.5 | (0.9) |
| Florida* | 68.2 | (1.8) | 26.8 | (1.6) | 5.0 | (0.8) | 73.6 | (1.5) | 20.8 | (1.2) | 5.7 | (0.8) | 74.5 | (1.6) | 21.1 | (1.2) | 4.4 | (0.8) | 66.2 | (1.9) | 22.8 | (1.4) | 10.9 | (1.2) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 74.3 | (1.2) | 20.6 | (1.3) | 5.2 | (0.8) | 78.5 | (1.2) | 16.4 | (1.0) | 5.0 | (0.6) | 77.4 | (1.3) | 18.2 | (1.2) | 4.4 | (0.6) | 70.3 | (1.4) | 21.7 | (1.2) | 8.0 | (0.8) |


| $\cdots$ Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 59.2 | (2.7) | \|37.5 (2.5)| | 3.4 | (0.6) | 79.8 | (1.8) | 18.1 | (1.7) | 2.0 | (0.7) | 79.8 | (1.5) | 18.0 | (1.4) | 2.2 | (0.6) | 64.9 | (2.4) | 28.2 | (2.2) $\mid$ | 6.9 (1.0) | (1.0) |
| \% Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 41.1 | (2.2) | 50.5 (2.5) | 8.5 | (1.3) | 41.0 | (1.6) | 51.8 | (1.9) | 7.2 | (1.4) | 49.1 | (2.4) | 46.3 | (3.0) | 4.6 | (1.0) | 38.4 | (2.3) | 49.8 | (3.2) | 11.9 | (1.9) |
| Alagoas | 23.9 | (3.0) | 55.1 (3.1) | 21.0 | (3.9) | 32.2 | (3.3) | 49.8 | (3.6) | 18.0 | (3.4) | 33.4 | (2.0) | 61.1 | (2.2) | 5.6 | (1.5) | 30.5 | (3.5) | 51.5 | (3.4) | 18.0 | (1.7) |
| Amapá | 30.7 | (2.9) | 52.7 (3.6) | 16.6 | (2.7) | 36.7 | (2.7) | 47.9 | (2.8) | 15.3 | (2.4) | 40.9 | (3.5) | 52.1 | (3.9) | 7.0 | (1.8) | 35.5 | (3.4) | 48.2 | (4.3) | 16.3 | (2.4) |
| Amazonas | 35.7 | (1.6) | 46.0 (1.1) | 18.3 | (1.4) | 41.1 | (2.9) | 42.6 | (2.7) | 16.4 | (1.7) | 46.1 | (2.0) | 45.2 | (2.1) | 8.7 | (1.2) | 35.4 | (1.3) | 45.6 | (2.7) | 19.0 | (2.7) |
| Bahia | 38.2 | (3.3) | 50.4 (3.4) | 11.4 | (2.4) | 43.0 | (4.2) | 46.4 | (3.1) | 10.6 | (2.7) | 45.9 | (2.5) | 46.9 | (2.1) | 7.2 | (1.4) | 41.2 | (2.8) | 46.2 | (3.0) | 12.7 | (1.6) |
| Ceará | 24.5 | (2.3) | 54.5 (2.4) | 21.0 | (2.3) | 29.4 | (2.7) | 53.8 | (2.6) | 16.7 | (2.5) | 34.2 | (1.6) | 56.4 | (1.8) | 9.3 | (2.1) | 25.5 | (1.5) | 56.9 | (2.0) | 17.6 | (2.2) |
| Espírito Santo | 45.0 | (2.2) | 39.7 (2.5) | 15.2 | (2.5) | 51.1 | (2.3) | 36.3 | (2.6) | 12.6 | (1.5) | 53.3 | (1.9) | 40.2 | (2.5) | 6.5 | (1.2) | 43.8 | (2.3) | 45.6 | (3.2) | 10.6 | (1.5) |
| Federal District | 43.6 | (4.6) | 43.1 (4.4) | 13.3 | (2.2) | 50.5 | (2.6) | 38.8 | (2.9) | 10.6 | (1.3) | 47.2 | (2.6) | 45.4 | (2.9) | 7.5 | (1.1) | 36.3 | (4.3) | 52.7 | (5.3) | 10.9 | (1.6) |
| Goiás | 43.4 | (2.7) | 37.5 (2.6) | 19.1 | (1.9) | 48.3 | (2.6) | 36.9 | (2.0) | 14.8 | (2.2) | 52.0 | (3.1) | 41.8 | (3.0) | 6.2 | (0.9) | 43.4 | (2.2) | 45.2 | (2.5) | 11.4 | (1.0) |
| Maranhão | 24.9 | (2.2) | 52.0 (3.0) | 23.1 | (4.3) | 31.0 | (2.6) | 52.1 | (3.9) | 16.9 | (2.5) | 34.8 | (2.6) | 55.4 | (3.2) | 9.8 | (1.8) | 26.5 | (2.4) | 54.1 | (1.8) | 19.5 | (1.8) |
| Mato Grosso | 35.2 | (2.6) | 50.8 (3.3) | 14.0 | (2.4) | 38.5 | (2.9) | 51.1 | (3.3) | 10.4 | (2.2) | 40.5 | (3.3) | 53.4 | (3.9) | 6.1 | (1.5) | 36.7 | (2.8) | 47.7 | (2.0) | 15.6 | (2.4) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 37.0 | (2.7) | 50.2 (2.0) | 12.8 | (1.8) | 41.6 | (2.5) | 47.9 | (2.3) | 10.5 | (2.3) | 45.3 | (3.0) | 45.8 | (2.2) | 8.9 | (1.6) | 35.9 | (2.8) | 53.1 | (2.9) | 11.0 | (1.8) |
| Minas Gerais | 45.8 | (2.9) | 40.3 (2.4) | 13.9 | (2.0) | 50.5 | (3.1) | 39.0 | (3.0) | 10.6 | (1.6) | 50.0 | (3.1) | 41.3 | (2.9) | 8.8 | (0.8) | 43.8 | (2.9) | 45.6 | (2.4) | 10.7 | (1.3) |
| Pará | 30.2 | (2.1) | 48.4 (2.1) | 21.5 | (2.0) | 35.5 | (2.3) | 47.8 | (2.2) | 16.7 | (2.2) | 39.1 | (2.5) | 53.0 | (2.4) | 7.9 | (1.3) | 32.0 | (2.3) | 47.8 | (1.8) | 20.2 | (2.7) |
| Paraíba | 39.7 | (2.3) | 42.9 (3.0) | 17.4 | (2.2) | 44.2 | (1.8) | 42.8 | (1.4) | 13.0 | (2.0) | 45.9 | (2.4) | 41.0 | (2.6) | 13.1 | (2.1) | 40.0 | (2.1) | 42.4 | (3.0) | 17.6 | (2.0) |
| Paraná | 54.0 | (2.3) | 37.3 (2.4) | 8.8 | (1.1) | 56.5 | (2.9) | 36.5 | (2.9) | 6.9 | (1.2) | 65.0 | (2.9) | 30.3 | (2.9) | 4.7 | (0.8) | 47.0 | (2.7) | 41.4 | (2.8) | 11.7 | (1.3) |
| Pernambuco | 33.1 | (2.8) | 43.1 (3.8) | 23.8 | (2.4) | 35.1 | (3.3) | 42.3 | (3.4) | 22.6 | (2.7) | 44.9 | (4.3) | 49.4 | (4.2) | 5.6 | (1.1) | 35.5 | (2.5) | 51.7 | (2.8) | 12.8 (1 | (1.5) |
| Piauí | 35.5 | (1.9) | 44.5 (1.9) | 20.0 | (2.3) | 42.5 | (2.9) | 45.8 | (2.9) | 11.7 | (1.2) | 43.3 | (3.2) | 44.8 | (2.9) | 11.9 | (1.6) | 40.6 | (3.3) | 40.2 | (3.4) | 19.2 | (1.2) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 30.3 | (3.1) | 50.9 (1.8) | 18.8 | (2.2) | 36.8 | (2.4) | 46.4 | (1.1) | 16.8 | (2.2) | 44.5 | (3.1) | 48.4 | (3.1) | 7.1 | (1.0) | 31.8 | (3.6) | 54.9 | (2.9) | 13.3 | (1.4) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 34.8 | (1.9) | 52.9 (2.1) | 12.3 | (2.5) | 38.0 | (2.6) | 49.7 | (2.6) | 12.3 | (1.9) | 43.3 | (3.3) | 44.5 | (2.9) | 12.2 | (2.5) | 35.7 | (2.8) | 48.8 | (3.4) | 15.5 | (2.4) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 52.5 | (3.1) | 37.7 (3.5) | 9.7 | (1.9) | 55.5 | (2.2) | 36.7 | (2.8) | 7.8 | (1.6) | 58.3 | (2.3) | 36.0 | (2.8) | 5.7 | (1.3) | 49.6 | (2.0) | 39.4 | (2.8) | 11.0 | (1.8) |
| Rondônia | 40.0 | (3.1) | 50.8 (2.6) | 9.2 | (1.9) | 41.0 | (2.2) | 48.7 | (2.6) | 10.3 | (1.8) | 49.4 | (3.3) | 47.3 | (3.0) | 3.3 | (0.9) | 43.2 | (2.3) | 47.6 | (2.3) | 9.2 (1. | (1.4) |
| Roraima | 33.9 | (3.0) | 51.7 (3.0) | 14.4 | (3.2) | 41.0 | (3.4) | 49.6 | (3.6) | 9.4 | (2.1) | 40.7 | (4.0) | 50.8 | (3.3) | 8.5 | (2.5) | 35.4 | (3.3) | 50.5 | (3.4) | 14.1 | (2.1) |
| Santa Catarina | 49.4 | (2.1) | 40.0 (2.2) | 10.6 | (2.0) | 54.9 | (2.1) | 38.3 | (2.1) | 6.9 | (1.6) | 59.8 | (1.7) | 33.0 | (1.7) | 7.2 | (1.1) | 49.7 | (2.8) | 40.5 | (3.3) | 9.8 (1. | (1.9) |
| São Paulo | 48.1 | (1.9) | 34.4 (1.7) | 17.5 | (1.0) | 51.2 | (1.7) | 33.2 | (1.6) | 15.6 | (1.1) | 57.4 | (1.7) | 37.2 | (1.5) | 5.5 | (0.8) | 45.0 | (1.6) | 45.0 | (1.4) | 10.0 | (1.2) |
| Sergipe | 30.5 | (3.3) | 51.9 (2.8) | 17.7 | (2.0) | 31.6 | (2.6) | 53.2 | (4.3) | 15.2 | (2.4) | 33.9 | (2.8) | 57.5 | (2.4) | 8.5 | (2.1) | 33.3 | (2.5) | 53.8 | (3.1) | 12.8 | (2.4) |
| Tocantins | 36.9 | (2.0) | 42.3 (3.1) | 20.8 | (2.3) | 40.5 | (2.7) | 43.0 | (2.5) | 16.5 | (3.0) | 48.3 | (2.6) | 45.7 | (2.2) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 37.6 | (1.9) | 50.0 | (2.0) | 12.4 | (1.2) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 42.1 | (2.3) | 41.9 (2.4) | 16.0 | (1.5) | 51.8 | (2.7) | 35.8 | (1.8) | 12.3 | (1.8) | 44.7 | (2.8) | 40.7 | (2.3) | 14.6 | (1.6) | 45.4 | (2.5) | 29.9 | (2.9) | 24.7 | (2.6) |
| Cali | 40.5 | (2.3) | 40.3 (2.4) | 19.2 | (2.6) | 51.7 | (2.1) | 35.5 | (1.9) | 12.8 | (1.5) | 41.9 | (2.4) | 41.0 | (2.7) | 17.0 | (2.4) | 50.6 | (3.1) | 32.9 | (3.4) | 16.5 | (2.7) |
| Manizales | 45.2 | (3.6) | 35.6 (2.4) | 19.2 | (2.3) | 52.8 | (2.6) | 31.8 | (2.4) | 15.4 | (0.8) | 43.0 | (3.9) | 41.3 | (3.0) | 15.7 | (1.7) | 38.9 | (3.0) | 26.1 | (3.1) | 35.1 | (2.9) |
| Medellin | 52.8 | (2.3) | 32.9 (2.3) | 14.2 | (1.8) | 52.5 | (3.3) | 35.2 | (2.7) | 12.3 | (1.9) | 48.7 | (2.4) | 36.5 | (1.6) | 14.8 | (1.6) | 54.3 | (2.8) | 23.7 | (2.4) | 22.0 | (2.3) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 27.7 | (2.0) | 59.6 (1.8) | 12.7 | (1.3)\| | 34.8 | (2.1) | 56.1 | (2.0) | 9.2 | (1.2) | 51.7 | (1.7) \| | 40.4 | (1.7) \| | 7.9 | (1.1) | 45.0 | (1.9) | 46.3 | (1.9) | 8.8 | (1.1) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 53.6 | (1.2) | 30.0 (0.9) | 16.4 | (0.8) | 68.7 | (1.4) | 20.8 | (1.1) | 10.5 | (0.8) | 59.8 | (1.2) | 25.5 | (0.9) | 14.7 | (0.8) | 59.1 | (1.4) | 27.6 | (1.2) | 13.3 | (0.7) |
| Ajman | 49.9 | (3.5) | 36.0 (2.3) | 14.1 | (2.2) | 69.5 | (3.4) | 20.4 | (2.0) | 10.1 | (2.3) | 59.1 | (3.5) | 28.8 | (2.7) | 12.0 | (1.5) | 59.1 | (3.7) | 30.1 | (2.5) | 10.8 | (2.0) |
| Dubai ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 49.2 | (1.0) | 31.7 (1.1) | 19.1 | (0.8) | 66.6 | (0.9) | 23.9 | (0.8) | 9.5 | (0.6) | 57.8 | (0.9) | 24.3 | (0.9) | 17.9 | (0.8) | 56.2 | (0.8) | 30.1 | (0.9) | 13.6 | (0.7) |
| Fujairah | 47.9 | (2.6) | 39.6 (2.3) | 12.5 | (1.3) | 69.3 | (2.8) | 23.9 | (2.4) | 6.8 | (0.9) | 57.1 | (3.8) | 31.7 | (3.1) | 11.2 | (1.5) | 57.9 | (2.8) | 29.9 | (2.0) | 12.2 | (2.2) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 45.4 | (3.1) | 38.6 (2.8) | 16.0 | (2.2) | 63.5 | (2.8) | 25.7 | (2.5) | 10.8 | (2.2) | 54.3 | (3.1) | 31.1 | (2.8) | 14.5 | (1.7) | 56.0 | (3.0) | 29.6 | (2.4) | 14.4 | (2.6) |
| Sharjah | 46.9 | (2.8) | 34.5 (2.1) | 18.6 | (2.2) | 67.5 | (3.3) | 26.0 | (2.7) | 6.5 | (1.1) | 57.0 | (3.8) | 25.7 | (2.5) | 17.4 | (2.3) | 58.7 | (3.4) | 30.1 | (2.9) | 11.2 | (1.4) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 55.1 | (3.4) | 35.6 (3.5) | 9.3 | (1.9) | 67.3 | 3.1) | 24.0 | (2.8) | 8.7 | (2.3) | 58.5 | (3.3) | 33.1 | (3.3) | 8.4 | 1.8 | 59.9 | (3.4) | 31.0 | (3.3) | (2 | (2.2) |

[^49]Note: See Table IV. 3.25 for national data.
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Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV.12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of creative extracurricular activities at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 2.35 | (0.01) | 1.42 | (0.03) | 2.00 | (0.01) | 2.98 | (0.03) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.01) |
| O New South Wales | 1.97 | (0.07) | 0.77 | (0.08) | 1.85 | (0.14) | 2.25 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| Northern territory | 1.53 | (0.14) | 0.40 | (0.08) | 1.30 | (0.38) | 2.00 | (0.01) | 2.45 | (0.26) | 0.88 | (0.06) |
| Queensland | 2.37 | (0.06) | 1.51 | (0.14) | 2.00 | (0.09) | 2.99 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.72 | (0.05) |
| South Australia | 2.08 | (0.07) | 1.10 | (0.19) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.21 | (0.18) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.77 | (0.06) |
| Tasmania | 2.20 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.11) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.81 | (0.06) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.86 | (0.04) |
| Victoria | 2.29 | (0.07) | 1.40 | (0.16) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.75 | (0.20) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| Western Australia | 2.27 | (0.08) | 1.08 | (0.18) | 2.02 | (0.15) | 3.00 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.84 | (0.05) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 1.21 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.02) | 0.93 | (0.12) | 1.52 | (0.15) | 2.40 | (0.09) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| French community | 1.97 | (0.07) | 0.77 | (0.08) | 1.85 | (0.14) | 2.25 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| German-speaking community | 2.29 | (0.07) | 1.40 | (0.16) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.75 | (0.20) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 2.65 | (0.07) | 1.63 | (0.21) | 2.99 | (0.14) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.64 | (0.07) |
| British Columbia | 2.59 | (0.09) | 1.57 | (0.17) | 2.77 | (0.22) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.69 | (0.09) |
| Manitoba | 2.74 | (0.05) | 1.98 | (0.20) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.64 | (0.08) |
| New Brunswick | 2.55 | (0.07) | 1.44 | (0.15) | 2.77 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.75 | (0.06) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 2.45 | (0.11) | 1.21 | (0.34) | 2.58 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.15) |
| Nova Scotia | 2.74 | (0.07) | 1.97 | (0.26) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.57 | (0.08) |
| Ontario | 2.80 | (0.04) | 2.19 | (0.18) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.43 | (0.05) |
| Prince Edward Island | 2.65 | (0.00) | 1.98 | (0.00) | 2.60 | (0.02) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.49 | (0.00) |
| Quebec | 2.55 | (0.05) | 1.52 | (0.11) | 2.68 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.72 | (0.05) |
| Saskatchewan | 2.50 | (0.07) | 1.35 | (0.20) | 2.65 | (0.13) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.80 | (0.09) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 1.41 | (0.11) | 0.33 | (0.22) | 1.00 | (0.16) | 1.98 | (0.18) | 2.35 | (0.15) | 0.87 | (0.07) |
| Basilicata | 0.97 | (0.09) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.65 | (0.22) | 1.04 | (0.14) | 2.20 | (0.11) | 0.86 | (0.05) |
| Bolzano | 1.39 | (0.01) | 0.51 | (0.02) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.29 | (0.03) | 2.75 | (0.02) | 0.92 | (0.01) |
| Calabria | 1.33 | (0.15) | 0.23 | (0.27) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.51 | (0.31) | 2.59 | (0.21) | 0.95 | (0.09) |
| Campania | 1.15 | (0.13) | 0.00 | (0.13) | 0.95 | (0.18) | 1.35 | (0.28) | 2.28 | (0.15) | 0.89 | (0.07) |
| Emilia Romagna | 1.57 | (0.13) | 0.32 | (0.20) | 1.09 | (0.23) | 2.00 | (0.13) | 2.86 | (0.20) | 1.01 | (0.07) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 1.60 | (0.10) | 0.14 | (0.22) | 1.14 | (0.22) | 2.11 | (0.12) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.07) |
| Lazio | 1.53 | (0.11) | 0.42 | (0.21) | 1.04 | (0.17) | 2.00 | (0.13) | 2.67 | (0.24) | 0.93 | (0.09) |
| Liguria | 1.14 | (0.08) | 0.23 | (0.17) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.19 | (0.23) | 2.13 | (0.09) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| Lombardia | 1.45 | (0.09) | 0.52 | (0.19) | 1.07 | (0.17) | 2.00 | (0.11) | 2.23 | (0.13) | 0.78 | (0.08) |
| Marche | 1.53 | (0.17) | 0.35 | (0.23) | 1.00 | (0.24) | 1.99 | (0.28) | 2.77 | (0.23) | 0.98 | (0.07) |
| Molise | 1.12 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.70 | (0.03) | 1.37 | (0.03) | 2.40 | (0.03) | 0.98 | (0.01) |
| Piemonte | 1.10 | (0.11) | 0.00 | (0.15) | 0.97 | (0.17) | 1.02 | (0.14) | 2.40 | (0.19) | 0.90 | (0.07) |
| Puglia | 1.28 | (0.10) | 0.11 | (0.19) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 1.71 | (0.24) | 2.30 | (0.10) | 0.89 | (0.06) |
| Sardegna | 1.25 | (0.12) | 0.07 | (0.19) | 1.00 | (0.09) | 1.72 | (0.29) | 2.22 | (0.13) | 0.87 | (0.07) |
| Sicilia | 1.57 | (0.15) | 0.28 | (0.23) | 1.13 | (0.25) | 2.00 | (0.09) | 2.88 | (0.21) | 1.02 | (0.07) |
| Toscana | 1.39 | (0.14) | 0.30 | (0.24) | 1.00 | (0.11) | 1.87 | (0.22) | 2.41 | (0.19) | 0.89 | (0.07) |
| Trento | 1.41 | (0.08) | 0.21 | (0.13) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.76 | (0.20) | 2.68 | (0.10) | 0.99 | (0.04) |
| Umbria | 1.36 | (0.08) | 0.26 | (0.24) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.56 | (0.16) | 2.63 | (0.05) | 0.96 | (0.05) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 1.22 | (0.08) | 2.09 | (0.01) | 0.94 | (0.01) |
| Veneto | 1.37 | (0.11) | 0.10 | (0.16) | 1.00 | (0.16) | 1.98 | (0.19) | 2.42 | (0.17) | 0.95 | (0.07) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 1.88 | (0.16) | 0.21 | (0.28) | 1.88 | (0.27) | 2.45 | (0.25) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.11 | (0.10) |
| Baja California | 1.79 | (0.22) | 0.62 | (0.18) | 1.38 | (0.51) | 2.18 | (0.31) | 3.00 | (0.11) | 0.97 | (0.07) |
| Baja California Sur | 1.64 | (0.19) | 0.00 | (0.16) | 1.64 | (0.41) | 2.00 | (0.17) | 2.93 | (0.27) | 1.10 | (0.07) |
| Campeche | 1.65 | (0.17) | 0.62 | (0.19) | 1.03 | (0.26) | 2.00 | (0.26) | 2.94 | (0.23) | 0.94 | (0.09) |
| Chiapas | 1.83 | (0.15) | 0.72 | (0.17) | 1.36 | (0.28) | 2.24 | (0.33) | 3.00 | (0.05) | 0.95 | (0.08) |
| Chihuahua | 2.21 | (0.16) | 0.89 | (0.35) | 2.00 | (0.23) | 2.97 | (0.26) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.10) |
| Coahuila | 1.89 | (0.15) | 0.54 | (0.22) | 1.71 | (0.33) | 2.34 | (0.29) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.10) |
| Colima | 1.51 | (0.10) | 0.45 | (0.23) | 1.00 | (0.14) | 1.96 | (0.18) | 2.64 | (0.11) | 0.92 | (0.08) |
| Distrito Federal | 2.05 | (0.12) | 0.86 | (0.29) | 2.00 | (0.13) | 2.36 | (0.27) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.09) |
| Durango | 2.00 | (0.18) | 0.61 | (0.14) | 1.77 | (0.30) | 2.62 | (0.38) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.05) |
| Guanajuato | 1.72 | (0.18) | 0.34 | (0.23) | 1.29 | (0.31) | 2.25 | (0.34) | 3.00 | (0.05) | 1.08 | (0.08) |
| Guerrero | 1.61 | (0.24) | 0.12 | (0.25) | 1.00 | (0.19) | 2.33 | (0.67) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.19 | (0.06) |
| Hidalgo | 1.88 | (0.14) | 0.66 | (0.17) | 1.63 | (0.26) | 2.24 | (0.29) | 3.00 | (0.04) | 0.94 | (0.08) |
| Jalisco | 1.32 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.17) | 0.92 | (0.29) | 1.80 | (0.27) | 2.58 | (0.17) | 1.02 | (0.08) |
| Mexico | 1.63 | (0.18) | 0.25 | (0.24) | 1.06 | (0.21) | 2.22 | (0.41) | 3.00 | (0.06) | 1.10 | (0.07) |
| Morelos | 1.99 | (0.10) | 0.87 | (0.32) | 2.00 | (0.05) | 2.08 | (0.19) | 3.00 | (0.07) | 0.83 | (0.11) |
| Nayarit | 1.55 | (0.13) | 0.10 | (0.21) | 1.16 | (0.24) | 2.00 | (0.13) | 2.96 | (0.16) | 1.09 | (0.06) |
| Nuevo León | 2.18 | (0.14) | 0.85 | (0.32) | 2.00 | (0.12) | 2.88 | (0.23) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.93 | (0.09) |
| Puebla | 1.89 | (0.11) | 0.68 | (0.15) | 1.73 | (0.26) | 2.16 | (0.23) | 3.00 | (0.05) | 0.91 | (0.08) |
| Querétaro | 1.81 | (0.14) | 0.71 | (0.20) | 1.14 | (0.32) | 2.41 | (0.40) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.00 | (0.08) |
| Quintana Roo | 1.75 | (0.17) | 0.49 | (0.27) | 1.34 | (0.37) | 2.19 | (0.19) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.02 | (0.09) |
| San Luis Potosí | 1.97 | (0.23) | 0.51 | (0.27) | 1.54 | (0.41) | 2.84 | (0.35) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.09 | (0.09) |
| Sinaloa | 2.06 | (0.16) | 0.45 | (0.38) | 2.00 | (0.14) | 2.81 | (0.32) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.06 | (0.11) |
| Tabasco | 1.71 | (0.22) | 0.00 | (0.12) | 1.50 | (0.64) | 2.35 | (0.33) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.20 | (0.10) |
| Tamaulipas | 1.97 | (0.19) | 0.71 | (0.08) | 1.57 | (0.39) | 2.60 | (0.40) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.04) |
| Tlaxcala | 2.00 | (0.12) | 0.84 | (0.14) | 1.87 | (0.19) | 2.29 | (0.26) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.06) |
| Veracruz | 1.81 | (0.17) | 0.47 | (0.21) | 1.71 | (0.32) | 2.07 | (0.25) | 3.00 | (0.17) | 0.98 | (0.09) |
| Yucatán | 1.85 | (0.20) | 0.29 | (0.20) | 1.56 | (0.33) | 2.55 | (0.38) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.12 | (0.07) |
| Zacatecas | 1.77 | (0.17) | 0.33 | (0.23) | 1.59 | (0.29) | 2.16 | (0.23) | 3.00 | (0.04) | 1.05 | (0.07) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.31 for national data.

[Part 2/4]
Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance, by region Table B2.IV. 12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of creative extracurricular activities at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 1.25 | (0.21) | 0.00 | (0.25) | 0.91 | (0.35) | 1.55 | (0.37) | 2.55 | (0.16) | 1.00 | (0.09) |
| Opain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 0.90 | (0.13) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.30 | (0.31) | 1.21 | (0.24) | 2.08 | (0.09) | 0.88 | (0.05) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 1.15 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.20) | 1.00 | (0.20) | 1.44 | (0.32) | 2.15 | (0.11) | 0.84 | (0.07) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.81 | (0.11) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.31 | (0.26) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 1.94 | (0.22) | 0.81 | (0.06) |
| Balearic Islands* | 1.00 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.60 | (0.26) | 1.24 | (0.25) | 2.14 | (0.10) | 0.88 | (0.06) |
| Basque Country* | 0.85 | (0.07) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.20 | (0.15) | 1.00 | (0.05) | 2.22 | (0.16) | 0.93 | (0.04) |
| Cantabria* | 0.94 | (0.10) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.63 | (0.25) | 1.11 | (0.21) | 2.00 | (0.07) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 1.26 | (0.10) | 0.22 | (0.20) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.55 | (0.25) | 2.27 | (0.14) | 0.85 | (0.07) |
| Catalonia* | 0.97 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.56 | (0.26) | 1.13 | (0.23) | 2.20 | (0.15) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 0.73 | (0.11) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.02 | (0.19) | 1.00 | (0.16) | 1.88 | (0.26) | 0.82 | (0.07) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.79 | (0.10) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.54 | (0.22) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.62 | (0.26) | 0.75 | (0.09) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 1.10 | (0.01) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.80 | (0.02) | 1.00 | (0.01) | 2.60 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.01) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.88 | (0.12) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.48 | (0.31) | 1.00 | (0.05) | 2.04 | (0.24) | 0.84 | (0.07) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 1.37 | (0.16) | 0.00 | (0.18) | 0.99 | (0.19) | 1.75 | (0.28) | 2.74 | (0.25) | 1.05 | (0.08) |
| Navarre* | 1.22 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.01) | 0.68 | (0.24) | 1.68 | (0.22) | 2.51 | (0.16) | 1.04 | (0.05) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 2.78 | (0.04) | 2.11 | (0.17) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.53 | (0.07) |
| Northern Ireland | 2.45 | (0.09) | 1.47 | (0.17) | 2.34 | (0.25) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.73 | (0.07) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 2.63 | (0.06) | 1.79 | (0.10) | 2.73 | (0.19) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.60 | (0.06) |
| Wales | 2.72 | (0.04) | 1.89 | (0.10) | 2.97 | (0.09) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.51 | (0.04) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 2.82 | (0.05) | 2.28 | (0.19) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.39 | (0.04) |
| Florida ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 2.91 | (0.04) | 2.64 | (0.17) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.29 | (0.06) |
| Massachusetts* | 2.69 | (0.11) | 1.76 | (0.44) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.71 | (0.14) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 1.78 | (0.17) | 0.29 | (0.23) | 1.34 | (0.29) | 2.49 | (0.30) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 1.13 | (0.07) |
| こ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 2.01 | (0.21) | 0.75 | (0.45) | 2.00 | (0.15) | 2.28 | (0.46) | 3.00 | (0.06) | 0.90 | (0.15) |
| Alagoas | 1.61 | (0.24) | 0.52 | (0.33) | 1.39 | (0.52) | 2.00 | (0.10) | 2.53 | (0.46) | 0.86 | (0.15) |
| Amapá | 1.56 | (0.18) | 0.32 | (0.33) | 1.29 | (0.34) | 2.00 | (0.05) | 2.64 | (0.30) | 0.95 | (0.12) |
| Amazonas | 2.01 | (0.23) | 0.84 | (0.49) | 2.00 | (0.22) | 2.22 | (0.38) | 3.00 | (0.11) | 0.86 | (0.12) |
| Bahia | 1.46 | (0.41) | 0.28 | (0.47) | 1.04 | (0.53) | 2.00 | (0.53) | 2.55 | (0.54) | 0.94 | (0.10) |
| Ceará | 1.58 | (0.20) | 0.31 | (0.25) | 1.00 | (0.07) | 2.01 | (0.61) | 3.00 | (0.17) | 1.08 | (0.12) |
| Espírito Santo | 1.00 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.25 | (0.47) | 1.71 | (0.56) | 2.03 | (0.02) | 0.94 | (0.05) |
| Federal District | 1.61 | (0.23) | 0.64 | (0.26) | 1.12 | (0.42) | 2.00 | (0.23) | 2.69 | (0.49) | 0.87 | (0.16) |
| Goiás | 0.95 | (0.22) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.56 | (0.47) | 1.00 | (0.15) | 2.26 | (0.48) | 0.92 | (0.14) |
| Maranhão | 1.01 | (0.27) | 0.00 | (0.18) | 0.83 | (0.41) | 1.07 | (0.39) | c | c | 0.83 | (0.10) |
| Mato Grosso | 1.15 | (0.17) | 0.00 | (0.04) | 0.79 | (0.25) | 1.42 | (0.40) | 2.39 | (0.26) | 0.96 | (0.11) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 0.99 | (0.09) | 0.10 | (0.17) | 1.00 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 1.85 | (0.21) | 0.66 | (0.06) |
| Minas Gerais | 1.34 | (0.18) | 0.29 | (0.29) | 1.00 | (0.07) | 1.79 | (0.35) | 2.30 | (0.28) | 0.86 | (0.12) |
| Pará | 1.51 | (0.35) | 0.00 | (0.24) | 0.98 | (0.38) | 2.09 | (0.99) | c | c | 1.18 | (0.13) |
| Paraíba | 1.13 | (0.14) | 0.00 | (0.18) | 0.95 | (0.26) | 1.24 | (0.41) | 2.35 | (0.25) | 0.90 | (0.12) |
| Paraná | 0.95 | (0.22) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.50 | (0.42) | 1.30 | (0.49) | 2.00 | (0.12) | 0.84 | (0.07) |
| Pernambuco | 1.61 | (0.34) | 0.28 | (0.44) | 1.58 | (0.55) | 2.00 | (0.08) | 2.57 | (0.53) | 0.94 | (0.13) |
| Piauí | 1.20 | (0.24) | 0.00 | (0.25) | 1.00 | (0.23) | 1.14 | (0.41) | 2.69 | (0.52) | 1.00 | (0.16) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 1.44 | (0.23) | c | c | 1.39 | (0.75) | 2.00 | (0.00) | 2.37 | (0.26) | 1.00 | (0.11) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 1.43 | (0.18) | 0.39 | (0.36) | 1.00 | (0.14) | 1.87 | (0.34) | 2.48 | (0.32) | 0.89 | (0.13) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 1.05 | (0.17) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.51 | (0.35) | 1.50 | (0.39) | 2.20 | (0.20) | 0.95 | (0.10) |
| Rondônia | 0.85 | (0.18) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.28 | (0.43) | 1.00 | (0.18) | 2.13 | (0.33) | 0.88 | (0.11) |
| Roraima | 1.12 | (0.22) | 0.00 | (0.11) | 0.67 | (0.40) | 1.16 | (0.33) | 2.66 | (0.33) | 1.05 | (0.12) |
| Santa Catarina | 1.54 | (0.14) | 0.64 | (0.07) | 1.30 | (0.40) | 2.00 | (0.08) | 2.20 | (0.20) | 0.73 | (0.07) |
| São Paulo | 1.12 | (0.11) | 0.02 | (0.17) | 1.00 | (0.15) | 1.27 | (0.25) | 2.18 | (0.08) | 0.83 | (0.06) |
| Sergipe | 1.41 | (0.26) | 0.20 | (0.29) | 1.00 | (0.08) | 1.58 | (0.62) | 2.89 | (0.45) | 1.04 | (0.18) |
| Tocantins | 0.99 | (0.15) | 0.00 | (0.00) | 0.62 | (0.31) | 1.08 | (0.20) | 2.26 | (0.35) | 0.90 | (0.13) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 1.80 | (0.16) | 0.31 | (0.26) | 1.73 | (0.28) | 2.16 | (0.24) | 3.00 | (0.04) | 1.04 | (0.09) |
| Cali | 1.95 | (0.11) | 0.78 | (0.13) | 1.59 | (0.26) | 2.45 | (0.24) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| Manizales | 1.58 | (0.19) | 0.01 | (0.21) | 1.14 | (0.33) | 2.18 | (0.29) | 3.00 | (0.10) | 1.15 | (0.07) |
| Medellin | 1.60 | (0.17) | 0.28 | (0.26) | 1.16 | (0.25) | 2.00 | (0.23) | 2.97 | (0.16) | 1.04 | (0.08) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 1.44 | (0.13) | 0.01 | (0.14) | 1.00 | (0.21) | 2.00 | (0.18) | 2.76 | (0.21) | 1.06 | (0.07) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | 1.31 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.06) | 0.99 | (0.10) | 1.91 | (0.14) | 2.36 | (0.10) | 0.95 | (0.03) |
| Ajman | 1.33 | (0.15) | 0.30 | (0.27) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.48 | (0.36) | 2.55 | (0.07) | 0.92 | (0.06) |
| Dubai* | 2.05 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.00) | 1.72 | (0.01) | 2.60 | (0.01) | 3.00 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.00) |
| Fujairah | 1.18 | (0.08) | 0.31 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.28 | (0.29) | 2.15 | (0.01) | 0.75 | (0.03) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 1.20 | (0.16) | 0.31 | (0.35) | 1.00 | (0.00) | 1.20 | (0.30) | 2.30 | (0.16) | 0.81 | (0.10) |
| Sharjah | 1.34 | (0.14) | 0.08 | (0.17) | 1.17 | (0.35) | 2.00 | (0.11) | 2.14 | (0.13) | 0.87 | (0.07) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 1.07 | (0.01) | c | c | 0.96 | (0.03) | 1.04 | (0.02) | c | c | 0.87 | (0.01) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.31 for national data.
StatLink (ninst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 3/4]
Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Explained variance } \\ \text { in student } \\ \text { performance } \\ (r \text {-squared x 100) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\bigcirc$ Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 496 | (7.3) | 520 | (7.8) | 523 | (10.2) | 523 | (10.3) | 16.7 | (4.4) | 1.4 | (0.21) | 1.6 | (0.87) |
| O New South Wales | 492 | (7.6) | 513 | (9.3) | 518 | (8.3) | 516 | (7.0) | 10.4 | (4.7) | 1.2 | (0.15) | 0.8 | (0.68) |
| Northern territory | 448 | (20.2) | 459 | (27.6) | 449 | (20.0) | 453 | (31.9) | 1.6 | (17.5) | 1.1 | (0.34) | 0.0 | (1.49) |
| Queensland | 478 | (7.1) | 494 | (6.0) | 520 | (7.9) | 522 | (6.8) | 27.3 | (6.1) | 1.5 | (0.17) | 4.4 | (1.89) |
| South Australia | 479 | (10.6) | 493 | (9.8) | 492 | (7.1) | 493 | (8.2) | 9.9 | (5.3) | 1.3 | (0.21) | 0.7 | (0.77) |
| Tasmania | 451 | (8.3) | 472 | (7.5) | 493 | (9.1) | 498 | (10.6) | 22.6 | (4.1) | 1.6 | (0.19) | 4.3 | (1.56) |
| Victoria | 483 | (5.0) | 490 | (5.7) | 513 | (8.7) | 520 | (8.1) | 19.1 | (4.7) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 2.6 | (1.08) |
| Western Australia | 489 | (8.4) | 510 | (8.8) | 535 | (8.6) | 537 | (9.1) | 24.5 | (5.3) | 1.6 | (0.25) | 4.7 | (1.98) |
| Belgium e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 483 | (9.0) | 537 | (8.4) | 553 | (7.7) | 559 | (8.7) | 27.9 | (5.7) | 2.3 | (0.35) | 6.6 | (2.77) |
| French community | 492 | (7.7) | 515 | (9.3) | 517 | (7.9) | 515 | (6.6) | 10.4 | (4.7) | 1.2 | (0.15) | 0.8 | (0.68) |
| German-speaking community | 487 | (5.5) | 487 | (6.8) | 512 | (10.5) | 518 | (8.6) | 19.1 | (4.7) | 1.3 | (0.14) | 2.6 | (1.08) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 495 | (9.8) | 525 | (8.5) | 524 | (9.3) | 525 | (6.4) | 23.0 | (6.5) | 1.4 | (0.25) | 2.6 | (1.72) |
| British Columbia | 505 | (8.0) | 527 | (8.5) | 529 | (6.8) | 528 | (7.2) | 16.5 | (4.9) | 1.4 | (0.22) | 1.8 | (1.21) |
| Manitoba | 494 | (6.9) | 491 | (6.6) | 492 | (6.5) | 492 | (6.9) | 0.7 | (5.5) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.13) |
| New Brunswick | 500 | (5.5) | 502 | (8.3) | 503 | (8.3) | 504 | (9.6) | 2.6 | (2.9) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.1 | (0.14) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 459 | (11.3) | 496 | (7.4) | 503 | (5.6) | 504 | (7.9) | 26.0 | (4.0) | 2.0 | (0.31) | 7.1 | (3.47) |
| Nova Scotia | 487 | (6.4) | 499 | (10.3) | 500 | (8.0) | 502 | (7.5) | 11.4 | (4.8) | 1.2 | (0.19) | 0.6 | (0.59) |
| Ontario | 513 | (6.9) | 516 | (6.9) | 515 | (5.8) | 514 | (6.0) | 2.1 | (8.1) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.15) |
| Prince Edward Island | 482 | (5.7) | 480 | (5.6) | 481 | (7.0) | 482 | (7.0) | 1.2 | (4.7) | 0.9 | (0.11) | 0.0 | (0.09) |
| Quebec | 522 | (7.2) | 537 | (6.7) | 543 | (5.8) | 542 | (5.5) | 15.9 | (5.1) | 1.3 | (0.16) | 1.6 | (1.01) |
| Saskatchewan | 515 | (7.0) | 504 | (7.4) | 501 | (6.4) | 504 | (5.9) | -8.3 | (4.0) | 0.9 | (0.10) | 0.6 | (0.55) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 463 | (20.3) | 501 | (16.7) | 455 | (13.5) | 484 | (13.7) | 8.7 | (10.4) | 1.3 | (0.39) | 0.7 | (1.89) |
| Basilicata | 471 | (11.5) | 457 | (9.3) | 451 | (11.9) | 478 | (10.9) | 2.6 | (7.3) | 1.0 | (0.29) | 0.1 | (0.53) |
| Bolzano | 485 | (4.3) | 504 | (6.2) | 517 | (5.9) | 526 | (4.2) | 16.6 | (2.3) | 1.6 | (0.17) | 3.0 | (0.80) |
| Calabria | 440 | (21.6) | 423 | (15.4) | 428 | (11.8) | 427 | (16.4) | -6.1 | (12.4) | 0.9 | (0.41) | 0.4 | (2.33) |
| Campania | 467 | (11.5) | 441 | (12.9) | 448 | (16.2) | 468 | (16.1) | 2.4 | (9.0) | 0.6 | (0.19) | 0.1 | (0.79) |
| Emilia Romagna | 478 | (14.1) | 485 | (16.3) | 512 | (16.9) | 541 | (16.5) | 24.6 | (7.7) | 1.5 | (0.42) | 6.6 | (3.93) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 470 | (20.4) | 515 | (14.2) | 542 | (9.2) | 552 | (9.1) | 29.3 | (5.1) | 2.6 | (0.74) | 13.4 | (4.23) |
| Lazio | 459 | (13.7) | 475 | (15.3) | 491 | (18.1) | 497 | (17.4) | 16.8 | (8.9) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 3.1 | (3.26) |
| Liguria | 462 | (8.8) | 492 | (12.6) | 492 | (10.8) | 502 | (15.8) | 19.3 | (8.5) | 1.5 | (0.23) | 2.6 | (2.22) |
| Lombardia | 502 | (13.0) | 515 | (13.5) | 528 | (13.3) | 529 | (12.3) | 15.3 | (10.2) | 1.4 | (0.33) | 1.9 | (2.46) |
| Marche | 498 | (15.1) | 507 | (14.9) | 489 | (22.0) | 503 | (10.3) | 0.4 | (7.9) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 0.0 | (0.72) |
| Molise | 461 | (8.3) | 462 | (7.8) | 455 | (7.1) | 455 | (6.8) | -3.7 | (3.4) | 1.3 | (0.22) | 0.2 | (0.39) |
| Piemonte | 484 | (12.5) | 495 | (11.7) | 491 | (12.9) | 524 | (15.4) | 12.8 | (8.7) | 1.2 | (0.31) | 1.7 | (2.21) |
| Puglia | 474 | (14.6) | 485 | (15.1) | 484 | (10.0) | 477 | (15.3) | 0.7 | (9.7) | 1.3 | (0.35) | 0.0 | (0.86) |
| Sardegna | 438 | (16.1) | 470 | (14.1) | 463 | (11.1) | 465 | (11.3) | 12.0 | (8.2) | 1.7 | (0.47) | 1.5 | (2.27) |
| Sicilia | 429 | (14.9) | 443 | (11.0) | 461 | (16.1) | 456 | (12.8) | 12.3 | (7.7) | 1.4 | (0.45) | 2.3 | (3.04) |
| Toscana | 494 | (15.4) | 486 | (13.0) | 501 | (15.2) | 507 | (16.3) | 6.7 | (12.3) | 1.0 | (0.31) | 0.4 | (1.72) |
| Trento | 515 | (10.9) | 516 | (14.4) | 542 | (11.2) | 534 | (14.4) | 8.9 | (6.6) | 1.3 | (0.30) | 1.1 | (1.60) |
| Umbria | 480 | (13.9) | 494 | (10.6) | 498 | (15.4) | 493 | (14.8) | 4.7 | (7.5) | 1.1 | (0.34) | 0.3 | (1.01) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 514 | (9.4) | 515 | (10.1) | 489 | (6.2) | 467 | (6.2) | -23.7 | (2.7) | 0.6 | (0.14) | 6.9 | (1.54) |
| Veneto | 494 | (12.7) | 558 | (18.1) | 521 | (13.6) | 518 | (17.7) | 7.0 | (8.6) | 1.7 | (0.42) | 0.5 | (1.68) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 409 | (13.1) | 430 | (9.9) | 445 | (11.0) | 464 | (9.7) | 19.0 | (4.4) | 1.8 | (0.38) | 8.3 | (3.78) |
| Baja California | 404 | (12.3) | 407 | (15.2) | 420 | (16.7) | 429 | (13.9) | 9.6 | (8.6) | 1.1 | (0.34) | 1.7 | (3.08) |
| Baja California Sur | 402 | (12.3) | 416 | (10.2) | 415 | (10.7) | 424 | (8.4) | 6.7 | (4.9) | 1.4 | (0.34) | 1.0 | (1.55) |
| Campeche | 386 | (6.6) | 379 | (10.2) | 400 | (12.8) | 418 | (8.0) | 13.9 | (4.2) | 1.2 | (0.22) | 3.4 | (1.83) |
| Chiapas | 363 | (7.6) | 365 | (10.9) | 373 | (19.4) | 391 | (16.1) | 11.9 | (7.5) | 1.0 | (0.28) | 2.3 | (2.90) |
| Chihuahua | 389 | (13.0) | 417 | (13.4) | 453 | (16.0) | 454 | (12.6) | 31.8 | (7.0) | 2.2 | (0.58) | 14.0 | (5.78) |
| Coahuila | 414 | (16.7) | 404 | (9.9) | 420 | (12.6) | 435 | (18.1) | 6.4 | (9.0) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 0.8 | (2.28) |
| Colima | 404 | (11.4) | 413 | (11.6) | 439 | (11.1) | 461 | (12.7) | 26.6 | (5.9) | 1.6 | (0.45) | 10.1 | (4.97) |
| Distrito Federal | 415 | (7.7) | 419 | (12.2) | 432 | (8.5) | 446 | (10.5) | 13.5 | (5.0) | 1.2 | (0.29) | 2.5 | (2.16) |
| Durango | 391 | (10.5) | 426 | (12.3) | 441 | (10.2) | 441 | (9.4) | 21.4 | (4.6) | 2.2 | (0.48) | 8.8 | (3.75) |
| Guanajuato | 396 | (13.3) | 410 | (14.0) | 424 | (10.3) | 416 | (14.4) | 9.6 | (7.1) | 1.6 | (0.45) | 1.9 | (2.81) |
| Guerrero | 360 | (8.4) | 366 | (12.0) | 368 | (8.8) | 379 | (9.8) | 6.1 | (4.6) | 1.2 | (0.29) | 1.2 | (1.72) |
| Hidalgo | 406 | (10.9) | 398 | (11.8) | 404 | (13.8) | 418 | (12.5) | 3.9 | (7.1) | 1.1 | (0.29) | 0.2 | (1.16) |
| Jalisco | 419 | (15.4) | 426 | (9.9) | 437 | (11.0) | 456 | (10.4) | 14.5 | (6.1) | 1.5 | (0.47) | 4.3 | (3.62) |
| Mexico | 412 | (10.9) | 412 | (10.2) | 423 | (8.5) | 422 | (15.5) | 4.4 | (6.8) | 1.1 | (0.29) | 0.5 | (1.78) |
| Morelos | 441 | (22.5) | 406 | (13.8) | 402 | (15.8) | 437 | (13.8) | -0.8 | (10.2) | 0.8 | (0.19) | 0.0 | (0.82) |
| Nayarit | 384 | (14.2) | 415 | (11.1) | 415 | (9.4) | 447 | (9.5) | 19.5 | (5.1) | 1.8 | (0.46) | 7.6 | (3.70) |
| Nuevo León | 409 | (14.2) | 448 | (12.1) | 445 | (13.0) | 443 | (17.5) | 14.7 | (7.5) | 1.7 | (0.43) | 3.4 | (3.60) |
| Puebla | 403 | (16.6) | 410 | (9.5) | 417 | (9.8) | 431 | (8.2) | 10.7 | (8.8) | 1.4 | (0.42) | 1.8 | (2.89) |
| Querétaro | 417 | (12.1) | 418 | (8.4) | 440 | (15.5) | 463 | (15.7) | 20.6 | (6.8) | 1.3 | (0.38) | 7.5 | (4.94) |
| Quintana Roo | 412 | (8.7) | 399 | (9.7) | 398 | (12.2) | 433 | (18.8) | 6.1 | (7.7) | 0.8 | (0.25) | 0.8 | (2.17) |
| San Luis Potosí | 396 | (12.8) | 421 | (19.8) | 418 | (15.4) | 413 | (10.5) | 7.6 | (6.5) | 1.4 | (0.34) | 1.2 | (2.36) |
| Sinaloa | 398 | (10.2) | 398 | (12.2) | 421 | (10.4) | 430 | (8.5) | 11.2 | (4.5) | 1.3 | (0.33) | 3.0 | (2.31) |
| Tabasco | 362 | (13.0) | 367 | (10.5) | 378 | (15.0) | 408 | (8.5) | 13.1 | (5.6) | 1.5 | (0.53) | 4.9 | (4.28) |
| Tamaulipas | 397 | (15.5) | 413 | (9.9) | 416 | (10.1) | 418 | (15.8) | 7.3 | (8.4) | 1.5 | (0.39) | 1.0 | (2.41) |
| Tlaxcala | 402 | (12.1) | 406 | (12.8) | 413 | (10.1) | 424 | (8.2) | 12.0 | (6.9) | 1.3 | (0.32) | 2.0 | (2.36) |
| Veracruz | 383 | (11.2) | 394 | (17.6) | 408 | (12.8) | 424 | (11.0) | 14.9 | (6.4) | 1.4 | (0.30) | 3.8 | (2.84) |
| Yucatán | 393 | (10.3) | 408 | (8.5) | 413 | (12.0) | 426 | (10.1) | 11.3 | (4.9) | 1.3 | (0.31) | 2.9 | (2.54) |
| Zacatecas | 389 | (11.7) | 407 | (7.9) | 411 | (7.6) | 427 | (7.2) | 13.7 | (4.5) | 1.5 | (0.31) | 4.0 | (2.88) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.31 for national data
StatLink 可insा http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 4/4]
Index of creative extracurricular activities at school and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 12 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Alentejo | 506 | (18.8) \| | 489 | (17.4) | 482 | (18.6) | 488 | (17.3) | -7.0 | (9.6) | 0.6 | (0.35) | 0.6 | (2.24) |
| O Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 469 | (8.1) | 472 | (7.5) | 474 | (9.0) | 474 | (10.7) | 3.1 | (5.0) | 1.0 | (0.18) | 0.1 | (0.48) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 474 | (12.4) | 500 | (10.6) | 505 | (10.2) | 508 | (13.3) | 14.9 | (9.2) | 1.5 | (0.32) | 1.8 | (2.16) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 492 | (10.8) | 496 | (10.5) | 496 | (8.0) | 516 | (12.3) | 10.7 | (8.6) | 1.1 | (0.17) | 0.9 | (1.42) |
| Balearic Islands* | 464 | (8.9) | 476 | (9.3) | 486 | (9.8) | 474 | (10.5) | 5.5 | (5.7) | 1.3 | (0.23) | 0.3 | (0.61) |
| Basque Country ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 502 | (4.2) | 504 | (4.6) | 504 | (5.9) | 513 | (6.5) | 3.7 | (3.9) | 1.0 | (0.09) | 0.2 | (0.35) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 475 | (10.3) | 483 | (10.2) | 497 | (9.5) | 510 | (5.4) | 18.1 | (4.4) | 1.5 | (0.19) | 2.5 | (1.26) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 506 | (7.0) | 506 | (9.7) | 509 | (8.4) | 515 | (7.3) | 5.1 | (4.3) | 1.1 | (0.18) | 0.3 | (0.47) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 495 | (6.9) | 495 | (8.2) | 495 | (10.7) | 488 | (14.5) | -4.2 | (6.2) | 1.0 | (0.15) | 0.2 | (0.69) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 456 | (8.2) | 457 | (7.8) | 467 | (15.1) | 469 | (12.1) | 5.8 | (6.4) | 1.0 | (0.20) | 0.3 | (0.65) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 488 | (6.8) | 486 | (8.3) | 487 | (9.1) | 494 | (9.1) | 2.5 | (5.7) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 0.1 | (0.28) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 505 | (5.2) | 506 | (5.9) | 504 | (6.2) | 503 | (4.4) | -1.1 | (2.5) | 1.1 | (0.11) | 0.0 | (0.07) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 496 | (9.4) | 501 | (8.6) | 500 | (10.8) | 518 | (7.7) | 10.2 | (4.9) | 1.2 | (0.20) | 1.0 | (0.98) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 467 | (13.7) | 456 | (12.0) | 461 | (11.1) | 464 | (9.5) | 0.2 | (6.3) | 0.9 | (0.23) | 0.0 | (0.45) |
| Navarre* | 512 | (7.4) | 511 | (7.1) | 519 | (7.0) | 524 | (6.9) | 4.6 | (3.6) | 1.0 | (0.21) | 0.3 | (0.49) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 484 | (7.0) | 500 | (8.2) | 504 | (7.2) | 500 | (7.5) | 20.6 | (8.1) | 1.3 | (0.19) | 1.3 | (1.05) |
| Northern Ireland | 467 | (12.0) | 489 | (10.1) | 490 | (10.2) | 489 | (9.1) | 17.8 | (9.8) | 1.4 | (0.27) | 2.0 | (2.29) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 489 | (6.2) | 497 | (5.8) | 503 | (5.3) | 503 | (5.2) | 8.6 | (6.0) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 0.4 | (0.52) |
| Wales | 466 | (3.9) | 469 | (5.6) | 470 | (6.3) | 469 | (4.7) | 1.7 | (5.0) | 1.0 | (0.10) | 0.0 | (0.09) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 478 | (13.9) | 512 | (9.3) | 517 | (9.4) | 516 | (9.9) | 50.6 | (15.0) | 1.6 | (0.33) | 4.1 | (2.52) |
| Florida* | 464 | (8.7) | 472 | (7.7) | 468 | (8.1) | 473 | (8.3) | 18.1 | (14.2) | 1.1 | (0.18) | 0.4 | (0.61) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 488 | (14.8) | 521 | (10.9) | 523 | (11.0) | 521 | (9.5) | 24.4 | (10.5) | 1.4 | (0.28) | 3.1 | (2.40) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 395 | (14.7) \| | 388 | (22.7) | 433 | (16.9) | 454 | (15.3) | 22.5 | (7.3) | 1.4 | (0.28) | 7.0 | (3.58) |
| こ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | 354 | (8.9) | 367 | (14.0) | 367 | (13.3) | 359 | (7.6) | 3.9 | (3.6) | 1.2 | (0.25) | 0.3 | (0.54) |
| Alagoas | 362 | (16.4) | 375 | (21.9) | 364 | (15.9) | 345 | (20.2) | -7.7 | (10.6) | 1.0 | (0.31) | 1.0 | (2.58) |
| Amapá | 367 | (24.4) | 365 | (10.3) | 350 | (11.9) | 362 | (17.2) | -3.2 | (13.1) | 0.9 | (0.43) | 0.3 | (3.05) |
| Amazonas | 359 | (11.1) | 375 | (17.1) | 359 | (13.7) | 360 | (14.4) | 1.3 | (6.9) | 1.1 | (0.37) | 0.1 | (0.75) |
| Bahia | 355 | (22.8) | 369 | (32.7) | 386 | (28.9) | 400 | (19.7) | 20.9 | (12.7) | 2.0 | (0.85) | 5.9 | (7.22) |
| Ceará | 369 | (7.9) | 372 | (9.2) | 392 | (30.8) | 431 | (25.9) | 22.8 | (9.3) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 10.7 | (7.59) |
| Espírito Santo | 411 | (15.8) | 409 | (12.8) | 438 | (29.7) | 443 | (32.7) | 16.5 | (21.0) | 1.0 | (0.41) | 3.3 | (8.26) |
| Federal District | 392 | (9.8) | 405 | (25.0) | 457 | (32.4) | 450 | (21.1) | 28.7 | (12.1) | 1.7 | (0.48) | 10.0 | (6.73) |
| Goiás | 378 | (16.8) | 385 | (14.3) | 392 | (16.7) | 383 | (17.6) | 5.8 | (11.8) | 1.1 | (0.36) | 0.6 | (2.61) |
| Maranhão | 355 | (7.2) | 337 | (22.0) | 334 | (31.2) | c | c | 16.7 | (13.3) | 0.7 | (0.31) | 3.6 | (4.93) |
| Mato Grosso | 389 | (24.1) | 355 | (11.8) | 367 | (23.7) | 377 | (24.0) | -4.0 | (11.4) | 0.8 | (0.35) | 0.3 | (2.32) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 389 | (17.0) | 429 | (13.6) | 422 | (14.9) | 412 | (12.0) | 15.3 | (10.2) | 1.7 | (0.53) | 1.9 | (2.66) |
| Minas Gerais | 386 | (7.3) | 393 | (7.0) | 417 | (10.8) | 437 | (17.9) | 26.0 | (5.4) | 1.6 | (0.36) | 10.2 | (5.21) |
| Pará | 338 | (14.1) | 385 | (17.9) | 398 | (10.8) | c | c | 15.1 | (7.9) | 2.7 | (0.62) | 7.8 | (8.85) |
| Paraíba | 347 | (20.4) | 403 | (23.6) | 419 | (14.4) | 440 | (20.9) | 34.2 | (11.8) | 2.9 | (0.81) | 15.7 | (10.52) |
| Paraná | 390 | (8.6) | 401 | (13.7) | 415 | (19.5) | 426 | (40.0) | 19.6 | (20.4) | 1.3 | (0.35) | 4.2 | (8.25) |
| Pernambuco | 372 | (10.1) | 369 | (18.2) | 355 | (15.2) | 374 | (17.0) | 0.0 | (4.6) | 0.8 | (0.21) | 0.0 | (0.38) |
| Piauí | 359 | (18.6) | 423 | (24.7) | 416 | (22.7) | 386 | (15.6) | 4.5 | (8.4) | 1.8 | (0.38) | 0.3 | (1.41) |
| Rio de Janeiro | c | c | 392 | (14.5) | 383 | (17.0) | 387 | (10.8) | -9.9 | (5.7) | 0.4 | (0.19) | 2.0 | (2.09) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 356 | (11.2) | 366 | (17.0) | 412 | (25.3) | 425 | (25.5) | 31.8 | (9.8) | 1.7 | (0.43) | 10.6 | (5.49) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 418 | (11.3) | 421 | (11.8) | 409 | (13.5) | 403 | (15.6) | -7.7 | (8.4) | 0.8 | (0.26) | 1.2 | (2.69) |
| Rondônia | 395 | (11.0) | 391 | (14.2) | 378 | (9.2) | 396 | (15.0) | 1.8 | (8.5) | 0.8 | (0.31) | 0.1 | (1.24) |
| Roraima | 376 | (28.5) | 356 | (12.2) | 360 | (19.5) | 391 | (17.8) | 9.4 | (13.6) | 1.4 | (0.56) | 1.9 | (5.71) |
| Santa Catarina | 424 | (15.1) | 427 | (14.0) | 433 | (12.3) | 433 | (11.6) | 3.4 | (11.7) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 0.1 | (1.33) |
| São Paulo | 387 | (9.3) | 419 | (11.0) | 414 | (11.5) | 399 | (9.0) | 5.1 | (5.9) | 1.3 | (0.24) | 0.3 | (0.78) |
| Sergipe | 371 | (10.5) | 403 | (18.9) | 391 | (15.7) | 414 | (21.8) | 13.1 | (8.2) | 1.7 | (0.38) | 3.8 | (4.47) |
| Tocantins | 363 | (15.1) | 366 | (13.1) | 357 | (15.2) | 390 | (18.0) | 10.6 | (8.2) | 1.1 | (0.34) | 1.6 | (2.47) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 387 | (10.3) | 394 | (8.4) | 393 | (7.5) | 402 | (5.7) | 5.3 | (3.7) | 1.4 | (0.20) | 0.7 | (1.03) |
| Cali | 393 | (9.9) | 388 | (13.3) | 372 | (9.0) | 368 | (9.2) | -12.0 | (5.6) | 0.6 | (0.16) | 2.6 | (2.45) |
| Manizales | 371 | (5.3) | 383 | (12.1) | 423 | (9.8) | 439 | (19.5) | 24.1 | (6.2) | 2.0 | (0.30) | 14.8 | (5.90) |
| Medellin | 362 | (7.3) | 379 | (11.6) | 396 | (15.7) | 437 | (21.4) | 26.5 | (7.1) | 1.7 | (0.33) | 11.1 | (4.99) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 467 | (6.9) \| | 468 | (11.3) | 497 | (11.9) | 502 | (16.4) | 14.3 | (6.2) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 2.9 | (2.49) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 407 | (7.7) | 411 | (8.9) | 431 | (7.2) | 465 | (10.2) | 26.0 | (4.7) | 1.4 | (0.21) | 8.2 | (2.91) |
| Ajman | 419 | (9.6) | 415 | (13.9) | 416 | (16.7) | 391 | (9.9) | -12.5 | (4.9) | 0.9 | (0.29) | 2.6 | (1.83) |
| Dubai ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 434 | (3.0) | 446 | (3.8) | 482 | (4.7) | 510 | (4.6) | 35.0 | (1.6) | 1.7 | (0.13) | 11.6 | (0.98) |
| Fujairah | 385 | (8.2) | 430 | (11.2) | 430 | (15.0) | 419 | (21.3) | 15.3 | (8.1) | 1.9 | (0.47) | 2.1 | (2.22) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 402 | (11.5) | 421 | (11.6) | 424 | (11.7) | 453 | (9.4) | 24.8 | (3.8) | 1.4 | (0.30) | 8.0 | (2.31) |
| Sharjah | 439 | (16.5) | 417 | (13.1) | 456 | (21.9) | 461 | (15.6) | 13.6 | (11.3) | 0.8 | (0.31) | 2.1 | (2.52) |
| Umm Al Quwain | c | c | 404 | (10.8) | 409 | (9.6) | c | c | 5.4 | (5.2) | 1.0 | (0.35) | 0.4 | (0.86) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.3.31 for national data.

[Part 1/1]
Pre-school attendance, by region
Table B2.IV. 14 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Percentage of students reporting that they had attended pre-primary education (ISCED 0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No attendance |  | For one year or less |  | For more than one year |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { attendance } \end{gathered}$ |  | For one year or less |  | For more than one year |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 2.1 | (0.6) | 46.0 | (1.5) | 51.8 | (1.6) | U | Alentejo | 11.3 | (1.6) | 17.4 | (1.3) | 71.3 | (2.0) |
| - New South Wales | 2.9 | (0.4) | 40.4 | (1.1) | 56.7 | (1.2) |  | Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northern territory | 4.9 | (1.2) | 61.4 | (3.3) | 33.7 | (3.4) |  | Andalusia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7.4 | (1.2) | 10.5 | (0.9) | 82.1 | (1.6) |
| Queensland | 5.2 | (0.5) | 54.5 | (1.2) | 40.3 | (1.1) |  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 6.1 | (0.9) | 7.0 | (0.8) | 87.0 | (1.4) |
| South Australia | 5.3 | (0.6) | 51.4 | (1.7) | 43.3 | (1.7) |  | Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 2.5 | (0.4) | 6.0 | (0.7) | 91.5 | (0.8) |
| Tasmania | 4.7 | (0.7) | 59.9 | (1.7) | 35.4 | (1.8) |  | Balearic Islands* | 7.0 | (0.9) | 8.3 | (1.0) | 84.6 | (1.5) |
| Victoria | 5.7 | (0.5) | 36.5 | (1.3) | 57.8 | (1.4) |  | Basque Country ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 10.3 | (0.8) | 11.4 | (0.6) | 78.2 | (1.1) |
| Western Australia | 5.9 | (0.7) | 39.4 | (1.3) | 54.6 | (1.4) |  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 3.9 | (0.6) | 7.3 | (0.8) | 88.8 | (1.0) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 4.5 | (0.6) | 4.8 | (0.7) | 90.7 | (1.0) |
| Flemish community ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 2.1 | (0.3) | 3.1 | (0.3) | 94.7 | (0.5) |  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 6.0 | (0.9) | 5.2 | (0.6) | 88.8 | (1.2) |
| French community | 2.7 | (0.4) | 6.1 | (0.5) | 91.2 | (0.6) |  | Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 3.6 | (0.6) | 7.4 | (0.8) | 89.0 | (1.2) |
| German-speaking community | 2.3 | (0.6) | 32.5 | (1.9) | 65.2 | (2.0) |  | Galicia* | 3.5 | (0.5) | 6.7 | (0.7) | 89.8 | (0.8) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 7.0 | (0.7) | 5.5 | (0.6) | 87.5 | (0.9) |
| Alberta | 4.6 | (0.5) | 57.3 | (1.5) | 38.1 | (1.6) |  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 4.5 | (0.7) | 9.2 | (1.0) | 86.3 | (1.3) |
| British Columbia | 4.6 | (0.6) | 50.1 | (1.6) | 45.3 | (1.7) |  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 6.9 | (1.2) | 8.2 | (0.7) | 84.9 | (1.5) |
| Manitoba | 6.1 | (0.7) | 53.1 | (1.6) | 40.8 | (1.5) |  | Navarre* | 9.4 | (0.9) | 9.8 | (1.0) | 80.8 | (1.5) |
| New Brunswick | 7.9 | (0.7) | 58.8 | (1.4) | 33.3 | (1.5) |  | United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 2.9 | (0.8) | 56.3 | (1.9) | 40.7 | (1.6) |  | England | 5.1 | (0.5) | 24.7 | (0.6) | 70.2 | (0.8) |
| Nova Scotia | 18.0 | (1.1) | 43.0 | (1.4) | 39.0 | (1.2) |  | Northern Ireland | 7.7 | (0.6) | 49.8 | (1.3) | 42.5 | (1.3) |
| Ontario | 5.9 | (0.4) | 25.7 | (1.3) | 68.5 | (1.2) |  | Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 3.0 | (0.3) | 29.7 | (1.0) | 67.3 | (1.0) |
| Prince Edward Island | 3.2 | (0.5) | 58.8 | (1.4) | 38.0 | (1.4) |  | Wales | 5.8 | (0.4) | 27.5 | (0.8) | 66.7 | (0.9) |
| Quebec | 19.9 | (0.9) | 45.0 | (1.0) | 35.0 | (1.3) |  | United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saskatchewan | 5.3 | (0.7) | 54.7 | (2.1) | 40.0 | (1.8) |  | Connecticut* | 1.0 | (0.4) | 12.8 | (0.9) | 86.2 | (1.1) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Florida* | 1.7 | (0.3) | 20.9 | (1.5) | 77.4 | (1.5) |
| Abruzzo | 3.7 | (0.5) | 5.5 | (0.8) | 90.8 | (1.1) |  | Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 1.2 | (0.3) | 13.7 | (1.0) | 85.1 | (1.1) |
| Basilicata | 1.6 | (0.3) | 3.5 | (0.5) | 94.9 | (0.6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolzano | 3.1 | (0.4) | 7.5 | (0.6) | 89.4 | (0.7) | n | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Calabria | 4.2 | (0.5) | 6.7 | (0.6) | 89.1 | (0.8) | \% | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 3.8 | (0.7) | 9.3 | (0.9) | 86.9 | (1.3) |
| Campania | 3.1 | (0.5) | 9.1 | (1.0) | 87.9 | (1.2) | \% | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emilia Romagna | 5.8 | (0.6) | 8.8 | (0.8) | 85.5 | (1.1) |  | Acre | 27.3 | (3.5) | 35.1 | (2.6) | 37.6 | (3.6) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 4.4 | (0.7) | 3.8 | (0.5) | 91.8 | (0.8) |  | Alagoas | 29.5 | (2.0) | 33.9 | (2.3) | 36.6 | (1.9) |
| Lazio | 4.5 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.8) | 87.0 | (0.9) |  | Amapá | 19.2 | (2.9) | 31.2 | (2.1) | 49.7 | (3.1) |
| Liguria | 6.6 | (0.8) | 10.5 | (1.1) | 83.0 | (1.2) |  | Amazonas | 32.7 | (2.7) | 28.4 | (1.9) | 38.9 | (2.8) |
| Lombardia | 3.9 | (0.5) | 6.8 | (0.8) | 89.3 | (1.0) |  | Bahia | 27.9 | (4.8) | 29.3 | (3.9) | 42.9 | (5.0) |
| Marche | 6.1 | (1.0) | 7.0 | (0.9) | 87.0 | (1.1) |  | Ceará | 26.0 | (2.0) | 25.5 | (2.0) | 48.6 | (2.1) |
| Molise | 3.1 | (0.6) | 3.7 | (0.6) | 93.2 | (0.8) |  | Espírito Santo | 14.8 | (1.1) | 21.8 | (1.9) | 63.3 | (2.5) |
| Piemonte | 3.8 | (0.7) | 8.8 | (0.7) | 87.4 | (1.1) |  | Federal District | 11.4 | (0.7) | 28.0 | (2.0) | 60.5 | (2.0) |
| Puglia | 2.8 | (0.5) | 6.9 | (0.6) | 90.3 | (0.7) |  | Goiás | 22.9 | (1.4) | 36.9 | (2.3) | 40.3 | (2.1) |
| Sardegna | 4.4 | (0.8) | 6.5 | (0.8) | 89.1 | (1.1) |  | Maranhão | 20.9 | (2.3) | 26.3 | (2.3) | 52.8 | (2.6) |
| Sicilia | 5.0 | (1.0) | 13.4 | (0.9) | 81.6 | (1.4) |  | Mato Grosso | 31.3 | (2.5) | 35.0 | (2.6) | 33.7 | (3.1) |
| Toscana | 4.6 | (0.7) | 8.4 | (0.8) | 87.0 | (0.9) |  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 22.7 | (2.7) | 34.1 | (2.7) | 43.2 | (3.6) |
| Trento | 5.1 | (0.8) | 4.8 | (0.6) | 90.1 | (1.1) |  | Minas Gerais | 12.4 | (1.8) | 34.3 | (2.3) | 53.3 | (2.6) |
| Umbria | 3.9 | (0.4) | 8.3 | (0.7) | 87.8 | (0.8) |  | Pará | 24.0 | (2.2) | 27.1 | (2.2) | 48.9 | (2.1) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 4.3 | (0.8) | 5.6 | (0.8) | 90.1 | (1.0) |  | Paraíba | 23.5 | (2.7) | 31.0 | (2.7) | 45.6 | (4.4) |
| Veneto | 5.6 | (1.0) | 5.7 | (0.7) | 88.7 | (1.2) |  | Paraná | 23.3 | (2.4) | 38.3 | (3.3) | 38.4 | (3.8) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pernambuco | 27.7 | (3.0) | 31.9 | (2.0) | 40.4 | (3.6) |
| Aguascalientes | 4.9 | (0.8) | 20.8 | (1.3) | 74.4 | (1.5) |  | Piauí | 14.7 | (2.2) | 28.9 | (1.7) | 56.3 | (2.1) |
| Baja California | 7.8 | (1.5) | 26.1 | (2.0) | 66.1 | (2.6) |  | Rio de Janeiro | 21.5 | (1.9) | 28.2 | (2.5) | 50.3 | (3.4) |
| Baja California Sur | 6.4 | (1.1) | 17.7 | (1.8) | 75.9 | (2.5) |  | Rio Grande do Norte | 19.5 | (1.7) | 30.6 | (2.2) | 49.9 | (2.8) |
| Campeche | 16.2 | (1.3) | 11.7 | (1.2) | 72.0 | (1.6) |  | Rio Grande do Sul | 22.0 | (2.1) | 45.0 | (1.9) | 33.0 | (2.2) |
| Chiapas | 21.9 | (2.1) | 12.3 | (1.2) | 65.8 | (2.5) |  | Rondônia | 35.7 | (3.5) | 28.0 | (1.9) | 36.4 | (3.1) |
| Chihuahua | 13.9 | (2.3) | 28.4 | (3.1) | 57.7 | (4.8) |  | Roraima | 24.3 | (1.9) | 27.4 | (1.5) | 48.3 | (2.1) |
| Coahuila | 6.7 | (1.0) | 18.3 | (1.7) | 74.9 | (2.1) |  | Santa Catarina | 18.3 | (2.7) | 38.8 | (3.0) | 42.9 | (4.6) |
| Colima | 8.3 | (1.1) | 14.1 | (1.5) | 77.7 | (1.5) |  | São Paulo | 11.2 | (1.0) | 35.5 | (1.8) | 53.3 | (1.9) |
| Distrito Federal | 5.6 | (0.9) | 17.1 | (1.1) | 77.4 | (1.6) |  | Sergipe | 13.1 | (1.9) | 36.8 | (1.9) | 50.1 | (2.5) |
| Durango | 7.1 | (1.2) | 18.5 | (1.7) | 74.4 | (2.3) |  | Tocantins | 28.6 | (2.4) | 38.0 | (2.2) | 33.4 | (2.5) |
| Guanajuato | 8.1 | (1.7) | 14.2 | (1.5) | 77.7 | (1.8) |  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guerrero | 15.8 | (1.7) | 14.8 | (1.4) | 69.3 | (2.5) |  | Bogota | 11.0 | (1.0) | 59.9 | (1.6) | 29.1 | (1.7) |
| Hidalgo | 9.1 | (1.3) | 26.4 | (2.1) | 64.4 | (2.5) |  | Cali | 16.2 | (1.3) | 47.3 | (1.8) | 36.4 | (1.7) |
| Jalisco | 7.3 | (1.2) | 12.7 | (1.3) | 80.0 | (1.4) |  | Manizales | 8.5 | (1.4) | 52.9 | (1.3) | 38.5 | (1.7) |
| Mexico | 8.5 | (1.8) | 23.7 | (1.7) | 67.8 | (3.0) |  | Medellin | 8.5 | (1.4) | 59.5 | (1.8) | 32.0 | (1.9) |
| Morelos | 8.0 | (1.0) | 21.1 | (1.5) | 71.0 | (2.0) |  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nayarit | 6.3 | (1.0) | 16.5 | (1.3) | 77.2 | (1.8) |  | Perm Territory region* | 10.0 | (1.1) | 7.0 | (0.7) | 83.0 | (1.4) |
| Nuevo León | 4.2 | (0.9) | 20.3 | (1.5) | 75.5 | (1.5) |  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Puebla | 11.9 | (1.7) | 14.0 | (1.6) | 74.1 | (2.7) |  | Abu Dhabi* | 27.1 | (1.1) | 25.6 | (0.9) | 47.3 | (1.3) |
| Querétaro | 5.1 | (1.5) | 19.4 | (2.0) | 75.5 | (3.0) |  | Ajman | 41.0 | (3.0) | 25.7 | (1.7) | 33.2 | (3.5) |
| Quintana Roo | 9.2 | (1.4) | 21.2 | (1.5) | 69.7 | (1.6) |  | Dubai ${ }^{-}$ | 17.3 | (0.6) | 28.9 | (0.8) | 53.8 | (0.8) |
| San Luis Potosí | 9.0 | (2.2) | 12.1 | (1.3) | 78.9 | (3.3) |  | Fujairah | 26.8 | (2.8) | 20.6 | (1.8) | 52.5 | (2.5) |
| Sinaloa | 8.1 | (1.2) | 20.1 | (1.8) | 71.8 | (1.7) |  | Ras Al Khaimah | 27.6 | (3.6) | 22.0 | (2.2) | 50.3 | (3.4) |
| Tabasco | 13.9 | (1.6) | 11.3 | (1.3) | 74.8 | (1.7) |  | Sharjah | 18.9 | (2.4) | 29.2 | (2.0) | 52.0 | (3.4) |
| Tamaulipas | 7.8 | (2.6) | 31.1 | (2.7) | 61.1 | (3.0) |  | Umm Al Quwain | 32.1 | (2.3) | 20.6 | (2.4) | 47.3 | (2.8) |
| Tlaxcala | 5.7 | (0.7) | 23.6 | (2.2) | 70.6 | (2.4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veracruz | 10.0 | (1.6) | 20.4 | (1.5) | 69.6 | (1.7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yucatán | 10.8 | (1.5) | 11.7 | (1.2) | 77.5 | (1.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zacatecas | 9.0 | (1.3) | 13.9 | (1.4) | 77.1 | (2.1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.3.33 for national data.

[Part 1/4]
Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance, by region Table B2.IV. 16 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | -0.25 | (0.01) | -0.82 | (0.00) | -0.68 | (0.01) | -0.34 | (0.01) | 0.85 | (0.05) | 0.75 | (0.01) |
| - New South Wales | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.79 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.05) | -0.14 | (0.06) | 1.35 | (0.16) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| Northern territory | -0.24 | (0.14) | -0.79 | (0.01) | -0.56 | (0.03) | -0.26 | (0.10) | 0.67 | (0.49) | 0.66 | (0.18) |
| Queensland | 0.10 | (0.09) | -0.80 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.28) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| South Australia | -0.01 | (0.10) | -0.82 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.05) | -0.06 | (0.30) | 1.44 | (0.11) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| Tasmania | 0.11 | (0.03) | -0.80 | (0.01) | -0.56 | (0.01) | 0.38 | (0.11) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.96 | (0.01) |
| Victoria | 0.43 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.04) | -0.18 | (0.08) | 1.09 | (0.24) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.02) |
| Western Australia | 0.08 | (0.08) | -0.75 | (0.03) | -0.43 | (0.05) | 0.06 | (0.25) | 1.44 | (0.06) | 0.87 | (0.04) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 0.12 | (0.07) | -0.64 | (0.04) | -0.42 | (0.03) | 0.08 | (0.22) | 1.44 | (0.03) | 0.83 | (0.03) |
| French community | -0.01 | (0.06) | -0.79 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.05) | -0.14 | (0.06) | 1.35 | (0.16) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| German-speaking community | 0.43 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.04) | -0.18 | (0.08) | 1.09 | (0.24) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.02) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | -0.65 | (0.04) | -1.00 | (0.03) | -0.81 | (0.01) | -0.69 | (0.04) | -0.11 | (0.11) | 0.43 | (0.06) |
| British Columbia | -0.39 | (0.06) | -0.86 | (0.02) | -0.72 | (0.03) | -0.39 | (0.07) | 0.41 | (0.20) | 0.61 | (0.08) |
| Manitoba | -0.40 | (0.04) | -0.88 | (0.02) | -0.77 | (0.02) | -0.54 | (0.04) | 0.58 | (0.13) | 0.69 | (0.05) |
| New Brunswick | -0.88 | (0.02) | -1.08 | (0.01) | -1.00 | (0.01) | -0.88 | (0.01) | -0.58 | (0.08) | 0.29 | (0.09) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | -0.98 | (0.03) | -1.17 | (0.01) | -1.04 | (0.01) | -0.99 | (0.01) | -0.73 | (0.10) | 0.33 | (0.10) |
| Nova Scotia | -0.84 | (0.07) | -1.15 | (0.03) | -0.99 | (0.04) | -0.84 | (0.08) | -0.36 | (0.16) | 0.37 | (0.09) |
| Ontario | -0.58 | (0.06) | -0.99 | (0.02) | -0.82 | (0.02) | -0.70 | (0.05) | 0.20 | (0.20) | 0.62 | (0.08) |
| Prince Edward Island | -0.86 | (0.00) | -1.09 | (0.00) | -0.85 | (0.00) | -0.81 | (0.00) | -0.68 | (0.01) | 0.23 | (0.01) |
| Quebec | -0.18 | (0.07) | -0.87 | (0.02) | -0.58 | (0.04) | -0.26 | (0.07) | 0.98 | (0.19) | 0.78 | (0.05) |
| Saskatchewan | -0.63 | (0.03) | -1.00 | (0.01) | -0.84 | (0.02) | -0.74 | (0.02) | 0.05 | (0.12) | 0.54 | (0.05) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 0.46 | (0.11) | -0.72 | (0.09) | -0.15 | (0.19) | 1.29 | (0.25) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Basilicata | 0.57 | (0.12) | -0.69 | (0.07) | 0.09 | (0.38) | 1.44 | (0.07) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
| Bolzano | -0.35 | (0.01) | -0.82 | (0.00) | -0.67 | (0.01) | -0.44 | (0.01) | 0.54 | (0.02) | 0.64 | (0.01) |
| Calabria | 0.51 | (0.11) | -0.68 | (0.08) | 0.07 | (0.29) | 1.20 | (0.13) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Campania | 0.76 | (0.11) | -0.56 | (0.18) | 0.73 | (0.28) | 1.44 | (0.10) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.07) |
| Emilia Romagna | 0.42 | (0.14) | -0.81 | (0.04) | -0.25 | (0.33) | 1.28 | (0.24) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 0.06 | (0.10) | -0.79 | (0.03) | -0.42 | (0.08) | 0.05 | (0.22) | 1.40 | (0.09) | 0.85 | (0.04) |
| Lazio | 0.34 | (0.13) | -0.78 | (0.05) | -0.31 | (0.20) | 1.02 | (0.35) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Liguria | 0.11 | (0.12) | -0.71 | (0.06) | -0.39 | (0.06) | 0.25 | (0.29) | 1.29 | (0.13) | 0.81 | (0.05) |
| Lombardia | -0.01 | (0.12) | -0.78 | (0.04) | -0.48 | (0.08) | 0.00 | (0.27) | 1.24 | (0.16) | 0.80 | (0.06) |
| Marche | 0.17 | (0.13) | -0.77 | (0.05) | -0.26 | (0.18) | 0.29 | (0.35) | 1.44 | (0.08) | 0.86 | (0.05) |
| Molise | 0.60 | (0.02) | -0.78 | (0.01) | 0.30 | (0.07) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.99 | (0.01) |
| Piemonte | 0.26 | (0.13) | -0.85 | (0.12) | -0.37 | (0.12) | 0.82 | (0.37) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.97 | (0.05) |
| Puglia | 0.34 | (0.14) | -0.76 | (0.05) | -0.34 | (0.20) | 1.04 | (0.37) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Sardegna | 0.18 | (0.11) | -0.81 | (0.04) | -0.39 | (0.14) | 0.47 | (0.31) | 1.44 | (0.02) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| Sicilia | 0.50 | (0.14) | -0.62 | (0.08) | -0.09 | (0.26) | 1.25 | (0.28) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.90 | (0.04) |
| Toscana | 0.44 | (0.14) | -0.66 | (0.07) | -0.09 | (0.28) | 1.08 | (0.29) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.88 | (0.04) |
| Trento | 0.22 | (0.09) | -0.83 | (0.03) | -0.28 | (0.17) | 0.65 | (0.11) | 1.37 | (0.10) | 0.87 | (0.02) |
| Umbria | 0.44 | (0.11) | -0.73 | (0.03) | -0.16 | (0.22) | 1.23 | (0.27) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.94 | (0.02) |
| Valle d'Aosta | -0.19 | (0.01) | -0.81 | (0.00) | -0.61 | (0.01) | -0.26 | (0.02) | 0.91 | (0.04) | 0.75 | (0.01) |
| Veneto | 0.50 | (0.12) | -0.54 | (0.07) | -0.02 | (0.20) | 1.12 | (0.26) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.83 | (0.04) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | -0.78 | (0.07) | -1.21 | (0.02) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.84 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.20) | 0.59 | (0.08) |
| Baja California | -0.85 | (0.09) | -1.25 | (0.03) | -1.07 | (0.11) | -0.83 | (0.08) | -0.23 | (0.30) | 0.59 | (0.15) |
| Baja California Sur | -0.79 | (0.09) | -1.17 | (0.03) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.85 | (0.10) | -0.05 | (0.28) | 0.56 | (0.11) |
| Campeche | -0.70 | (0.08) | -1.13 | (0.02) | -1.02 | (0.02) | -0.82 | (0.12) | 0.17 | (0.22) | 0.59 | (0.09) |
| Chiapas | -0.89 | (0.07) | -1.24 | (0.02) | -1.11 | (0.02) | -0.92 | (0.12) | -0.28 | (0.18) | 0.45 | (0.08) |
| Chihuahua | -0.87 | (0.10) | -1.25 | (0.01) | -1.17 | (0.06) | -0.96 | (0.12) | -0.08 | (0.29) | 0.59 | (0.13) |
| Coahuila | -0.81 | (0.06) | -1.15 | (0.03) | -1.07 | (0.04) | -0.88 | (0.06) | -0.15 | (0.21) | 0.55 | (0.09) |
| Colima | -0.75 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.02) | -1.02 | (0.07) | -0.79 | (0.07) | -0.06 | (0.11) | 0.48 | (0.03) |
| Distrito Federal | -0.95 | (0.05) | -1.23 | (0.04) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.90 | (0.09) | -0.58 | (0.13) | 0.30 | (0.06) |
| Durango | -0.73 | (0.13) | -1.21 | (0.03) | -0.95 | (0.08) | -0.80 | (0.11) | 0.07 | (0.37) | 0.53 | (0.10) |
| Guanajuato | -0.80 | (0.08) | -1.23 | (0.03) | -1.09 | (0.03) | -0.97 | (0.05) | 0.09 | (0.29) | 0.73 | (0.12) |
| Guerrero | -0.92 | (0.07) | -1.26 | (0.02) | -1.11 | (0.05) | -1.02 | (0.07) | -0.28 | (0.23) | 0.52 | (0.10) |
| Hidalgo | -0.89 | (0.07) | -1.25 | (0.02) | -1.09 | (0.04) | -0.90 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.25) | 0.51 | (0.12) |
| Jalisco | -0.90 | (0.07) | -1.22 | (0.05) | -1.04 | (0.05) | -0.88 | (0.07) | -0.45 | (0.19) | 0.41 | (0.11) |
| Mexico | -0.93 | (0.06) | -1.25 | (0.02) | -1.12 | (0.04) | -0.91 | (0.09) | -0.43 | (0.22) | 0.46 | (0.16) |
| Morelos | -0.69 | (0.09) | -1.13 | (0.04) | -0.87 | (0.06) | -0.81 | (0.03) | 0.07 | (0.33) | 0.59 | (0.14) |
| Nayarit | -0.71 | (0.11) | -1.24 | (0.03) | -1.05 | (0.04) | -0.86 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.36) | 0.73 | (0.11) |
| Nuevo León | -0.59 | (0.15) | -1.20 | (0.04) | -0.98 | (0.11) | -0.48 | (0.17) | 0.31 | (0.38) | 0.70 | (0.15) |
| Puebla | -0.80 | (0.11) | -1.23 | (0.03) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.91 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.37) | 0.66 | (0.17) |
| Querétaro | -0.80 | (0.09) | -1.16 | (0.02) | -1.09 | (0.08) | -0.81 | (0.14) | -0.13 | (0.23) | 0.53 | (0.12) |
| Quintana Roo | -0.89 | (0.07) | -1.20 | (0.03) | -1.07 | (0.04) | -0.87 | (0.07) | -0.41 | (0.25) | 0.52 | (0.15) |
| San Luis Potosí | -0.97 | (0.05) | -1.24 | (0.02) | -1.11 | (0.03) | -0.96 | (0.07) | -0.57 | (0.13) | 0.32 | (0.08) |
| Sinaloa | -0.98 | (0.05) | -1.25 | (0.01) | -1.13 | (0.05) | -0.90 | (0.09) | -0.63 | (0.09) | 0.27 | (0.04) |
| Tabasco | -1.00 | (0.05) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.15 | (0.03) | -1.04 | (0.08) | -0.54 | (0.15) | 0.34 | (0.08) |
| Tamaulipas | -0.88 | (0.04) | -1.12 | (0.01) | -1.06 | (0.05) | -0.84 | (0.05) | -0.52 | (0.10) | 0.34 | (0.03) |
| Tlaxcala | -0.88 | (0.08) | -1.24 | (0.03) | -1.09 | (0.01) | -0.97 | (0.07) | -0.23 | (0.26) | 0.56 | (0.13) |
| Veracruz | -1.05 | (0.04) | -1.24 | (0.02) | -1.10 | (0.03) | -1.07 | (0.04) | -0.76 | (0.09) | 0.22 | (0.05) |
| Yucatán | -0.79 | (0.11) | -1.25 | (0.01) | -1.11 | (0.02) | -0.97 | (0.12) | 0.17 | (0.37) | 0.67 | (0.15) |
| Zacatecas | -0.79 | (0.07) | -1.15 | (0.02) | -1.07 | (0.02) | -0.90 | (0.06) | -0.05 | (0.22) | 0.57 | (0.07) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.4.3 for national data.
StatLink ज्ञाड़्डा http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

Part 2/4]
Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 16 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard <br> deviation S.E. |  |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | -0.57 | (0.14) | -1.05 | (0.03) | -0.90 | (0.06) | -0.68 | (0.16) | 0.36 | (0.41) | 0.65 | (0.14) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | -0.64 | (0.07) | -1.14 | (0.05) | -0.85 | (0.07) | -0.60 | (0.09) | 0.04 | (0.16) | 0.52 | (0.09) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.55 | (0.09) | -1.08 | (0.02) | -0.85 | (0.04) | -0.73 | (0.08) | 0.45 | (0.28) | 0.73 | (0.09) |
| Asturias* | -0.66 | (0.08) | -1.10 | (0.02) | -0.86 | (0.06) | -0.73 | (0.05) | 0.05 | (0.24) | 0.55 | (0.11) |
| Balearic Islands* | -0.43 | (0.07) | -0.98 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.03) | -0.52 | (0.07) | 0.58 | (0.23) | 0.72 | (0.08) |
| Basque Country* | 0.09 | (0.07) | -0.80 | (0.02) | -0.48 | (0.05) | 0.20 | (0.22) | 1.44 | (0.01) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| Cantabria* | -0.51 | (0.06) | -1.02 | (0.06) | -0.76 | (0.04) | -0.53 | (0.08) | 0.27 | (0.18) | 0.58 | (0.08) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.44 | (0.10) | -1.01 | (0.06) | -0.81 | (0.01) | -0.55 | (0.12) | 0.62 | (0.31) | 0.75 | (0.11) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.19 | (0.13) | -0.90 | (0.03) | -0.70 | (0.07) | -0.30 | (0.15) | 1.15 | (0.36) | 0.85 | (0.10) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | -0.62 | (0.08) | -1.12 | (0.02) | -0.93 | (0.07) | -0.65 | (0.12) | 0.21 | (0.21) | 0.58 | (0.09) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -0.55 | (0.06) | -0.97 | (0.04) | -0.79 | (0.04) | -0.54 | (0.06) | 0.09 | (0.20) | 0.50 | (0.10) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | -0.55 | (0.01) | -1.03 | (0.00) | -0.85 | (0.00) | -0.65 | (0.00) | 0.33 | (0.02) | 0.67 | (0.01) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | -0.65 | (0.07) | -1.10 | (0.04) | -0.83 | (0.03) | -0.66 | (0.08) | -0.01 | (0.22) | 0.51 | (0.12) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.48 | (0.09) | -1.04 | (0.05) | -0.82 | (0.03) | -0.64 | (0.06) | 0.58 | (0.29) | 0.74 | (0.09) |
| Navarre* | -0.37 | (0.06) | -0.98 | (0.04) | -0.74 | (0.03) | -0.44 | (0.08) | 0.66 | (0.17) | 0.70 | (0.05) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 0.99 | (0.06) | -0.35 | (0.20) | 1.44 | (0.08) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.81 | (0.04) |
| Northern Ireland | 0.89 | (0.08) | -0.36 | (0.10) | 1.05 | (0.24) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.82 | (0.04) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.28 | (0.08) | -0.68 | (0.04) | -0.34 | (0.07) | 0.71 | (0.24) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Wales | 0.88 | (0.06) | -0.27 | (0.06) | 0.90 | (0.21) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.79 | (0.03) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | -0.01 | (0.15) | -0.90 | (0.05) | -0.66 | (0.13) | 0.08 | (0.43) | 1.44 | (0.09) | 0.94 | (0.06) |
| Florida• | -0.82 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.02) | -0.99 | (0.05) | -0.80 | (0.04) | -0.35 | (0.14) | 0.34 | (0.04) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 0.29 | (0.09) | -0.74 | (0.04) | -0.23 | (0.12) | 0.71 | (0.26) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 0.89 | (0.03) |


| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| § Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | -0.11 | (0.12) | -0.95 | (0.05) | -0.63 | (0.11) | -0.12 | (0.26) | 1.26 | (0.19) | 0.87 | (0.07) |
| Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | -0.55 | (0.08) | -1.01 | (0.04) | -0.88 | (0.05) | -0.68 | (0.13) | 0.38 | (0.21) | 0.68 | (0.08) |
| Alagoas | -0.25 | (0.23) | -1.10 | (0.08) | -0.81 | (0.08) | -0.16 | (0.48) | 1.08 | (0.44) | 0.89 | (0.15) |
| Amapá | -0.29 | (0.09) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.72 | (0.11) | -0.32 | (0.08) | 0.86 | (0.29) | 0.75 | (0.08) |
| Amazonas | -0.55 | (0.19) | -1.16 | (0.02) | -1.00 | (0.09) | -0.79 | (0.12) | 0.76 | (0.65) | 0.87 | (0.18) |
| Bahia | -0.30 | (0.17) | -0.99 | (0.08) | -0.68 | (0.18) | -0.18 | (0.22) | c | c | 0.69 | (0.15) |
| Ceará | -0.20 | (0.11) | -1.00 | (0.10) | -0.57 | (0.13) | -0.13 | (0.18) | 0.92 | (0.18) | 0.78 | (0.06) |
| Espírito Santo | -0.64 | (0.20) | -1.11 | (0.02) | -1.06 | (0.04) | -0.84 | (0.08) | 0.46 | (0.75) | 0.80 | (0.23) |
| Federal District | -0.32 | (0.16) | -1.10 | (0.12) | -0.81 | (0.04) | -0.24 | (0.32) | 0.89 | (0.44) | 0.83 | (0.17) |
| Goiás | -0.56 | (0.17) | -1.12 | (0.04) | -0.95 | (0.08) | -0.73 | (0.09) | 0.55 | (0.56) | 0.80 | (0.18) |
| Maranhão | -0.46 | (0.17) | c | c | -0.89 | (0.12) | -0.40 | (0.26) | 0.56 | (0.45) | 0.74 | (0.16) |
| Mato Grosso | -0.02 | (0.21) | -0.91 | (0.07) | -0.60 | (0.17) | 0.13 | (0.45) | 1.32 | (0.27) | 0.89 | (0.11) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | -0.59 | (0.11) | -1.07 | (0.03) | -0.90 | (0.06) | -0.79 | (0.05) | 0.40 | (0.41) | 0.72 | (0.14) |
| Minas Gerais | -0.51 | (0.15) | -1.04 | (0.04) | -0.84 | (0.05) | -0.59 | (0.18) | 0.43 | (0.46) | 0.68 | (0.18) |
| Pará | -0.16 | (0.10) | -0.99 | (0.08) | -0.80 | (0.07) | -0.29 | (0.34) | c |  | 1.00 | (0.06) |
| Paraíba | 0.12 | (0.30) | -0.86 | (0.04) | -0.52 | (0.34) | 0.44 | (0.82) | 1.44 | (0.13) | 0.96 | (0.09) |
| Paraná | -0.35 | (0.13) | -0.99 | (0.10) | -0.69 | (0.13) | -0.42 | (0.12) | 0.70 | (0.36) | 0.72 | (0.11) |
| Pernambuco | -0.64 | (0.11) | -1.11 | (0.06) | -0.87 | (0.07) | -0.76 | (0.08) | 0.20 | (0.40) | 0.64 | (0.17) |
| Piauí | -0.33 | (0.16) | -1.07 | (0.04) | -0.95 | (0.06) | -0.57 | (0.41) | 1.30 | (0.27) | 0.99 | (0.09) |
| Rio de Janeiro | -0.55 | (0.08) | -1.17 | (0.04) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.57 | (0.15) | 0.54 | (0.11) | 0.73 | (0.04) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 0.01 | (0.16) | -0.90 | (0.07) | -0.55 | (0.23) | 0.18 | (0.36) | 1.32 | (0.18) | 0.89 | (0.08) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 0.02 | (0.13) | -0.81 | (0.09) | -0.41 | (0.09) | 0.09 | (0.27) | 1.21 | (0.20) | 0.79 | (0.06) |
| Rondônia | -0.38 | (0.16) | -1.05 | (0.09) | -0.75 | (0.11) | -0.47 | (0.20) | 0.73 | (0.39) | 0.72 | (0.12) |
| Roraima | -0.46 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.06) | -0.87 | (0.08) | -0.49 | (0.12) | 0.62 | (0.21) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| Santa Catarina | -0.64 | (0.17) | -1.19 | (0.04) | -1.05 | (0.08) | -0.73 | (0.17) | 0.39 | (0.53) | 0.77 | (0.19) |
| São Paulo | -0.54 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.02) | -0.93 | (0.05) | -0.66 | (0.09) | 0.53 | (0.22) | 0.75 | (0.08) |
| Sergipe | -0.30 | (0.20) | -1.04 | (0.11) | -0.78 | (0.11) | -0.43 | (0.25) | 1.06 | (0.50) | 0.87 | (0.14) |
| Tocantins | -0.53 | (0.12) | -1.06 | (0.03) | -0.87 | (0.07) | -0.67 | (0.10) | 0.48 | (0.36) | 0.70 | (0.12) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | -0.11 | (0.10) | -1.02 | (0.07) | -0.52 | (0.13) | 0.07 | (0.17) | 1.05 | (0.15) | 0.82 | (0.05) |
| Cali | -0.04 | (0.13) | -0.94 | (0.07) | -0.53 | (0.15) | 0.13 | (0.27) | 1.20 | (0.15) | 0.84 | (0.06) |
| Manizales | -0.14 | (0.12) | -1.07 | (0.07) | -0.73 | (0.08) | 0.03 | (0.30) | 1.21 | (0.15) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| Medellin | -0.20 | (0.13) | -1.04 | (0.07) | -0.71 | (0.09) | -0.22 | (0.19) | 1.16 | (0.28) | 0.87 | (0.09) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 0.13 | (0.10) | -0.75 | (0.04) | $-0.46$ | (0.05) | 0.29 | (0.37) | 1.44 | (0.02) | 0.90 | (0.05) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | -0.62 | (0.06) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.24 | (0.02) | -0.89 | (0.05) | 0.90 | (0.20) | 0.96 | (0.06) |
| Ajman | -0.91 | (0.12) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.23 | (0.05) | -1.04 | (0.04) | -0.11 | (0.42) | 0.60 | (0.19) |
| Dubai* | 0.25 | (0.00) | -1.18 | (0.00) | -0.43 | (0.01) | 1.15 | (0.01) | 1.44 | (0.00) | 1.13 | (0.00) |
| Fujairah | -0.77 | (0.18) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.15 | (0.02) | -1.03 | (0.04) | 0.37 | (0.70) | 0.85 | (0.23) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | -0.89 | (0.02) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.24 | (0.03) | -1.13 | (0.02) | 0.07 | (0.08) | 0.80 | (0.02) |
| Sharjah | -0.65 | (0.15) | -1.19 | (0.03) | -0.90 | (0.07) | -0.79 | (0.07) | 0.29 | (0.52) | 0.72 | (0.18) |
| Umm Al Quwain | -0.82 | (0.01) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.26 | (0.00) | -1.13 | (0.00) | 0.37 | (0.04) | 0.91 | (0.01) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.4.3 for national data.
StatLink (-nilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 3/4]
Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV.16 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Explained variance } \\ \text { in student } \\ \text { performance } \\ (r \text { r-squared } \mathbf{x ~ 1 0 0 )} \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 523 | (8.4) | 525 | (8.1) | 515 | (8.2) | 508 | (7.4) | 2.3 | (4.5) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.15) |
| - New South Wales | 501 | (6.8) | 516 | (10.7) | 511 | (7.2) | 511 | (10.3) | 1.4 | (6.1) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.26) |
| Northern territory | 430 | (17.1) | 434 | (16.3) | 465 | (17.2) | 481 | (22.6) | 26.2 | (13.4) | 1.5 | (0.37) | 2.5 | (3.38) |
| Queensland | 498 | (7.0) | 497 | (7.5) | 505 | (7.7) | 513 | (8.7) | 7.3 | (4.8) | 1.1 | (0.15) | 0.5 | (0.70) |
| South Australia | 490 | (6.3) | 483 | (7.9) | 500 | (10.3) | 484 | (12.6) | -1.2 | (6.3) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.35) |
| Tasmania | 484 | (6.0) | 484 | (5.9) | 460 | (7.6) | 484 | (8.2) | 1.2 | (3.2) | 0.9 | (0.15) | 0.0 | (0.13) |
| Victoria | 486 | (6.5) | 499 | (7.0) | 511 | (6.9) | 509 | (8.6) | 10.4 | (4.4) | 1.3 | (0.14) | 1.1 | (0.93) |
| Western Australia | 500 | (9.4) | 520 | (8.6) | 519 | (7.7) | 526 | (10.7) | 8.5 | (6.4) | 1.3 | (0.20) | 0.6 | (0.85) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 534 | (10.9) | 548 | (12.2) | 521 | (13.8) | 522 | (9.9) | -7.1 | (7.1) | 0.9 | (0.17) | 0.3 | (0.88) |
| French community | 501 | (6.8) | 516 | (11.0) | 510 | (8.1) | 511 | (10.3) | 1.4 | (6.1) | 1.0 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.26) |
| German-speaking community | 488 | (6.2) | 498 | (6.7) | 509 | (7.8) | 510 | (8.2) | 10.4 | (4.4) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 1.1 | (0.93) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 520 | (9.1) | 514 | (7.0) | 504 | (11.5) | 531 | (12.6) | 16.0 | (8.7) | 0.9 | (0.17) | 0.6 | (0.64) |
| British Columbia | 519 | (7.2) | 523 | (10.5) | 524 | (8.7) | 523 | (6.7) | 0.5 | (6.4) | 1.2 | (0.16) | 0.0 | (0.14) |
| Manitoba | 481 | (8.3) | 494 | (8.8) | 487 | (6.5) | 507 | (8.3) | 11.3 | (5.6) | 1.1 | (0.20) | 0.8 | (0.76) |
| New Brunswick | 493 | (6.8) | 497 | (8.1) | 508 | (6.3) | 512 | (6.6) | 11.9 | (9.8) | 1.2 | (0.18) | 0.2 | (0.27) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 489 | (8.5) | 486 | (13.4) | 498 | (11.0) | 489 | (6.2) | 27.9 | (4.1) | 1.1 | (0.35) | 1.1 | (0.77) |
| Nova Scotia | 492 | (8.2) | 507 | (10.1) | 501 | (11.6) | 488 | (20.1) | -8.3 | (11.9) | 1.1 | (0.19) | 0.2 | (0.40) |
| Ontario | 509 | (5.9) | 524 | (8.9) | 515 | (7.9) | 510 | (8.8) | -1.2 | (5.1) | 1.1 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.13) |
| Prince Edward Island | 479 | (4.8) | 481 | (5.5) | 477 | (5.9) | 488 | (6.0) | 14.2 | (9.2) | 1.1 | (0.12) | 0.2 | (0.21) |
| Quebec | 525 | (7.1) | 527 | (8.3) | 545 | (10.5) | 546 | (9.9) | 15.0 | (5.3) | 1.1 | (0.16) | 1.6 | (1.27) |
| Saskatchewan | 510 | (7.3) | 507 | (6.4) | 511 | (7.5) | 496 | (6.4) | -1.9 | (4.6) | 0.9 | (0.14) | 0.0 | (0.10) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 457 | (20.0) | 475 | (14.8) | 488 | (14.1) | 484 | (9.2) | 12.4 | (9.3) | 1.5 | (0.47) | 1.7 | (2.64) |
| Basilicata | 467 | (14.2) | 488 | (12.4) | 456 | (11.3) | 451 | (7.5) | -8.0 | (7.5) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 0.8 | (1.66) |
| Bolzano | 472 | (4.3) | 522 | (4.0) | 519 | (6.8) | 512 | (4.1) | 2.2 | (2.5) | 1.9 | (0.22) | 0.0 | (0.07) |
| Calabria | 417 | (14.4) | 445 | (16.9) | 432 | (13.1) | 426 | (12.4) | 2.0 | (9.5) | 1.2 | (0.35) | 0.1 | (0.76) |
| Campania | 448 | (19.7) | 445 | (22.9) | 460 | (13.6) | 457 | (13.2) | 7.1 | (9.1) | 1.1 | (0.33) | 0.5 | (1.19) |
| Emilia Romagna | 476 | (15.2) | 502 | (20.6) | 514 | (15.4) | 509 | (14.5) | 12.3 | (10.0) | 1.5 | (0.41) | 1.6 | (2.57) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 527 | (18.7) | 508 | (8.4) | 514 | (14.0) | 543 | (16.6) | 13.1 | (12.0) | 1.0 | (0.42) | 1.6 | (2.88) |
| Lazio | 488 | (25.1) | 457 | (27.0) | 470 | (20.1) | 484 | (14.3) | 1.9 | (10.4) | 0.9 | (0.33) | 0.0 | (0.98) |
| Liguria | 456 | (15.1) | 498 | (19.6) | 482 | (10.4) | 516 | (17.6) | 22.5 | (8.2) | 1.7 | (0.41) | 4.0 | (3.06) |
| Lombardia | 496 | (22.8) | 535 | (13.0) | 530 | (11.4) | 506 | (14.8) | -2.3 | (10.0) | 1.6 | (0.37) | 0.1 | (0.96) |
| Marche | 505 | (13.6) | 486 | (12.3) | 493 | (18.0) | 501 | (10.6) | 3.0 | (7.4) | 1.0 | (0.31) | 0.1 | (0.46) |
| Molise | 491 | (4.9) | 441 | (5.4) | 468 | (6.8) | 466 | (6.5) | -4.2 | (2.6) | 0.4 | (0.08) | 0.3 | (0.34) |
| Piemonte | 495 | (17.9) | 491 | (9.2) | 513 | (13.1) | 495 | (13.1) | 6.4 | (8.8) | 1.2 | (0.38) | 0.5 | (1.53) |
| Puglia | 464 | (16.2) | 475 | (21.5) | 486 | (11.1) | 487 | (12.5) | 10.3 | (7.4) | 1.5 | (0.47) | 1.3 | (1.87) |
| Sardegna | 459 | (11.7) | 463 | (13.3) | 446 | (11.6) | 464 | (15.8) | 1.1 | (8.5) | 1.0 | (0.25) | 0.0 | (0.61) |
| Sicilia | 460 | (15.5) | 430 | (17.7) | 457 | (13.7) | 440 | (12.9) | -1.7 | (9.7) | 0.7 | (0.27) | 0.0 | (0.93) |
| Toscana | 493 | (14.2) | 521 | (20.4) | 465 | (19.8) | 503 | (17.4) | -5.5 | (11.0) | 1.1 | (0.30) | 0.3 | (1.28) |
| Trento | 482 | (12.4) | 540 | (9.9) | 560 | (7.7) | 515 | (20.6) | 14.8 | (10.2) | 2.5 | (0.71) | 2.4 | (3.50) |
| Umbria | 520 | (9.8) | 499 | (17.0) | 482 | (21.0) | 468 | (14.6) | -21.1 | (8.4) | 0.5 | (0.16) | 5.0 | (3.67) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 481 | (5.3) | 514 | (6.6) | 502 | (7.5) | 471 | (5.6) | -7.4 | (3.8) | 1.0 | (0.17) | 0.5 | (0.46) |
| Veneto | 531 | (19.2) | 538 | (20.4) | 517 | (18.1) | 507 | (12.4) | -14.9 | (11.1) | 0.8 | (0.32) | 1.9 | (2.93) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 434 | (10.4) | 406 | (15.0) | 449 | (15.0) | 459 | (9.8) | 22.3 | (10.8) | 1.0 | (0.20) | 3.2 | (2.31) |
| Baja California | 420 | (17.6) | 405 | (16.0) | 419 | (22.1) | 417 | (12.7) | 12.4 | (6.4) | 0.8 | (0.40) | 1.0 | (1.16) |
| Baja California Sur | 415 | (8.8) | 402 | (15.9) | 440 | (11.5) | 401 | (18.5) | -15.8 | (11.2) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 1.5 | (2.29) |
| Campeche | 394 | (9.0) | 397 | (9.8) | 384 | (6.7) | 407 | (9.8) | 16.9 | (8.3) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 2.0 | (1.62) |
| Chiapas | 364 | (16.7) | 382 | (13.5) | 362 | (18.2) | 384 | (18.7) | 6.7 | (14.2) | 1.4 | (0.50) | 0.2 | (0.90) |
| Chihuahua | 423 | (18.1) | 433 | (19.0) | 431 | (17.3) | 426 | (17.3) | -2.3 | (11.8) | 0.9 | (0.32) | 0.0 | (0.63) |
| Coahuila | 402 | (12.2) | 410 | (13.7) | 425 | (20.7) | 436 | (12.1) | 5.2 | (9.1) | 1.5 | (0.44) | 0.2 | (0.70) |
| Colima | 423 | (14.3) | 414 | (15.2) | 449 | (18.6) | 431 | (10.4) | 5.4 | (9.7) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 0.1 | (0.52) |
| Distrito Federal | 411 | (11.5) | 392 | (23.8) | 453 | (16.8) | 456 | (13.7) | 86.1 | (11.2) | 1.2 | (0.48) | 12.1 | (5.36) |
| Durango | 435 | (9.3) | 410 | (10.6) | 408 | (15.0) | 444 | (15.3) | 12.2 | (12.3) | 0.7 | (0.19) | 0.8 | (1.62) |
| Guanajuato | 388 | (15.1) | 402 | (15.1) | 416 | (16.6) | 441 | (10.6) | 9.9 | (8.1) | 1.6 | (0.52) | 0.9 | (1.35) |
| Guerrero | 371 | (11.3) | 354 | (8.4) | 374 | (13.4) | 368 | (13.2) | -7.2 | (15.4) | 0.9 | (0.31) | 0.3 | (1.54) |
| Hidalgo | 390 | (11.6) | 382 | (17.9) | 434 | (13.5) | 420 | (11.8) | 19.5 | (15.0) | 1.3 | (0.30) | 1.8 | (2.75) |
| Jalisco | 436 | (18.3) | 434 | (16.7) | 433 | (15.3) | 436 | (12.2) | 2.3 | (12.0) | 1.0 | (0.36) | 0.0 | (0.41) |
| Mexico | 409 | (11.4) | 410 | (7.5) | 423 | (13.5) | 428 | (14.6) | 34.2 | (12.5) | 1.3 | (0.33) | 5.4 | (6.02) |
| Morelos | 419 | (15.4) | 423 | (24.6) | 403 | (17.7) | 440 | (23.0) | 0.1 | (8.6) | 1.0 | (0.26) | 0.0 | (0.29) |
| Nayarit | 422 | (11.6) | 396 | (13.5) | 409 | (13.0) | 428 | (9.5) | 10.5 | (6.1) | 0.7 | (0.21) | 1.0 | (1.25) |
| Nuevo León | 435 | (12.4) | 416 | (17.3) | 448 | (16.0) | 445 | (18.2) | 2.5 | (13.2) | 1.0 | (0.34) | 0.1 | (1.21) |
| Puebla | 407 | (14.2) | 417 | (11.8) | 416 | (11.4) | 421 | (11.5) | 1.9 | (8.4) | 1.3 | (0.42) | 0.0 | (0.46) |
| Querétaro | 426 | (10.2) | 437 | (18.3) | 450 | (18.4) | 426 | (17.7) | 6.4 | (10.7) | 1.1 | (0.27) | 0.2 | (0.80) |
| Quintana Roo | 406 | (6.4) | 408 | (9.6) | 405 | (11.6) | 423 | (14.4) | 20.5 | (6.9) | 1.1 | (0.24) | 2.2 | (1.83) |
| San Luis Potosí | 416 | (17.1) | 389 | (20.4) | 419 | (10.7) | 423 | (19.2) | 18.9 | (35.7) | 1.0 | (0.30) | 0.7 | (2.82) |
| Sinaloa | 425 | (10.8) | 417 | (15.7) | 399 | (9.9) | 402 | (13.1) | -32.5 | (25.3) | 0.6 | (0.18) | 1.6 | (2.55) |
| Tabasco | 384 | (7.5) | 372 | (10.7) | 392 | (15.0) | 365 | (21.4) | -16.4 | (23.5) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.6 | (1.98) |
| Tamaulipas | 396 | (10.9) | 404 | (12.4) | 419 | (15.2) | 425 | (15.3) | 30.4 | (16.9) | 1.2 | (0.29) | 2.0 | (2.04) |
| Tlaxcala | 422 | (9.1) | 406 | (13.8) | 408 | (12.2) | 409 | (12.5) | -2.4 | (8.7) | 0.7 | (0.20) | 0.1 | (0.43) |
| Veracruz | 415 | (15.4) | 402 | (12.2) | 396 | (11.2) | 396 | (16.8) | -28.8 | (28.0) | 0.6 | (0.20) | 0.7 | (1.33) |
| Yucatán | 420 | (8.9) | 389 | (9.0) | 400 | (16.9) | 430 | (14.1) | 21.4 | (6.6) | 0.6 | (0.20) | 3.7 | (2.69) |
| Zacatecas | 399 | (8.9) | 410 | (9.7) | 413 | (11.1) | 412 | (9.7) | 7.2 | (8.0) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 0.3 | (0.59) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
see Table IV.4.3 for national data.


Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment and mathematics performance, by region

|  | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 477 | (28.5) | 497 | (28.6) | 500 | (17.7) \| | 481 | (15.2) | -11.8 | (18.0) | 1.1 | (0.53) | 0.7 | (2.85) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 456 | (9.7) | 483 | (11.1) | 467 | (10.2) | 483 | (8.1) | 13.3 | (9.3) | 1.3 | (0.23) | 0.7 | (0.98) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 507 | (10.9) | 492 | (12.5) | 481 | (10.8) | 505 | (13.6) | 4.1 | (7.2) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.1 | (0.45) |
| Asturias* | 496 | (14.6) | 496 | (8.0) | 510 | (14.4) | 497 | (11.3) | 4.7 | (11.1) | 1.0 | (0.27) | 0.1 | (0.50) |
| Balearic Islands* | 463 | (7.8) | 461 | (10.0) | 470 | (13.8) | 507 | (6.6) | 24.0 | (5.6) | 1.3 | (0.21) | 3.9 | (1.46) |
| Basque Country* | 504 | (6.1) | 510 | (4.8) | 509 | (5.3) | 499 | (6.0) | -1.4 | (3.5) | 1.1 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.18) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 488 | (6.8) | 490 | (10.9) | 485 | (9.0) | 503 | (9.8) | -1.7 | (7.3) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 0.0 | (0.18) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 502 | (11.4) | 518 | (8.9) | 498 | (11.5) | 517 | (7.4) | 5.7 | (5.0) | 1.2 | (0.25) | 0.3 | (0.48) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 483 | (10.9) | 499 | (15.0) | 486 | (9.7) | 504 | (12.6) | 8.9 | (6.5) | 1.2 | (0.21) | 0.8 | (1.26) |
| Extremadura* | 462 | (10.5) | 456 | (7.5) | 469 | (8.2) | 461 | (11.0) | 0.8 | (13.1) | 1.0 | (0.21) | 0.0 | (0.51) |
| Galicia* | 480 | (7.4) | 472 | (11.8) | 502 | (8.6) | 501 | (8.8) | 15.6 | (7.6) | 1.3 | (0.23) | 0.8 | (0.66) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 489 | (5.6) | 495 | (5.8) | 502 | (5.4) | 526 | (4.4) | 17.6 | (3.4) | 1.2 | (0.14) | 1.4 | (0.53) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 483 | (8.8) | 505 | (8.9) | 514 | (11.1) | 513 | (14.0) | 23.0 | (11.6) | 1.5 | (0.24) | 1.8 | (2.00) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 452 | (11.8) | 453 | (8.8) | 447 | (11.9) | 494 | (17.6) | 25.7 | (8.0) | 1.1 | (0.24) | 4.4 | (2.83) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 517 | (7.0) | 515 | (7.6) | 521 | (7.6) | 514 | (6.1) | 0.5 | (5.0) | 1.0 | (0.12) | 0.0 | (0.14) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 471 | (6.1) | 501 | (9.0) | 503 | (6.2) | 505 | (6.5) | 16.0 | (4.1) | 1.4 | (0.18) | 1.9 | (0.97) |
| Northern Ireland | 497 | (13.2) | 478 | (9.5) | 487 | (7.0) | 485 | (6.8) | -6.7 | (8.0) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 0.3 | (0.97) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 495 | (5.7) | 498 | (6.9) | 500 | (5.6) | 501 | (6.5) | 2.3 | (3.8) | 1.0 | (0.13) | 0.1 | (0.28) |
| Wales | 472 | (4.9) | 470 | (4.5) | 466 | (4.6) | 466 | (4.7) | -3.0 | (3.8) | 0.9 | (0.11) | 0.1 | (0.19) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 506 | (17.9) | 502 | (12.3) | 511 | (12.4) | 504 | (12.9) | -0.4 | (9.1) | 1.1 | (0.31) | 0.0 | (0.60) |
| Florida* | 478 | (7.8) | 446 | (12.4) | 470 | (15.5) | 474 | (13.4) | 11.3 | (13.5) | 0.8 | (0.15) | 0.2 | (0.53) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 500 | (12.7) | 520 | (12.0) | 520 | (10.6) | 513 | (18.0) | 3.4 | (9.4) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 0.1 | (0.75) |
| n Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cong$ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 369 | (23.4) | 415 | (25.1) | 428 | (13.5) | 460 | (14.1) | 35.2 | (8.3) | 2.4 | (0.62) | 10.5 | (4.30) |
| こ Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Acre | 353 | (7.9) | 347 | (9.5) | 363 | (12.9) | 376 | (17.9) | 30.9 | (10.1) | 1.0 | (0.25) | 9.8 | (7.32) |
| Alagoas | 322 | (17.2) | 361 | (20.4) | 338 | (26.6) | 347 | (27.4) | 1.0 | (11.6) | 1.5 | (0.47) | 0.0 | (2.01) |
| Amapá | 368 | (9.4) | 352 | (21.7) | 363 | (14.1) | 358 | (11.7) | -1.6 | (7.6) | 0.7 | (0.21) | 0.1 | (0.87) |
| Amazonas | 350 | (10.2) | 355 | (12.5) | 361 | (18.0) | 363 | (10.2) | 2.9 | (6.0) | 1.0 | (0.24) | 0.2 | (0.89) |
| Bahia | 378 | (24.0) | 367 | (19.3) | 397 | (39.5) | c | c | -28.1 | (12.9) | 0.7 | (0.49) | 6.2 | (5.82) |
| Ceará | 380 | (33.9) | 372 | (41.5) | 392 | (19.5) | 374 | (11.0) | -3.1 | (11.4) | 1.8 | (0.63) | 0.1 | (1.22) |
| Espírito Santo | 383 | (9.9) | 392 | (13.9) | 453 | (33.4) | 444 | (46.9) | 48.5 | (5.1) | 1.6 | (0.41) | 20.4 | (12.33) |
| Federal District | 387 | (17.2) | 377 | (15.3) | 424 | (36.6) | 458 | (30.3) | 41.6 | (14.2) | 1.3 | (0.41) | 17.6 | (12.16) |
| Goiás | 380 | (15.4) | 354 | (20.7) | 384 | (23.0) | 401 | (19.7) | 20.8 | (11.3) | 0.7 | (0.26) | 5.3 | (5.82) |
| Maranhão | c | c | 357 | (36.2) | 360 | (27.4) | 340 | (13.6) | -1.5 | (11.4) | 1.3 | (0.39) | 0.0 | (0.93) |
| Mato Grosso | 360 | (7.1) | 366 | (20.2) | 360 | (34.0) | 395 | (28.0) | 12.7 | (10.3) | 1.0 | (0.30) | 2.4 | (4.01) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | 396 | (8.1) | 398 | (20.6) | 421 | (16.5) | 418 | (15.9) | 24.6 | (8.0) | 1.0 | (0.34) | 5.8 | (3.93) |
| Minas Gerais | 392 | (8.7) | 389 | (7.1) | 402 | (23.8) | 430 | (20.9) | 22.5 | (8.7) | 1.1 | (0.24) | 4.7 | (3.78) |
| Pará | 343 | (9.1) | 340 | (11.0) | 342 | (15.1) | c | c | 34.4 | (3.6) | 1.3 | (0.35) | 25.8 | (3.59) |
| Paraíba | 397 | (30.8) | 386 | (25.9) | 382 | (27.2) | 416 | (21.2) | 10.6 | (19.4) | 1.2 | (0.68) | 1.7 | (6.86) |
| Paraná | 405 | (35.9) | 423 | (57.2) | 387 | (20.8) | 399 | (11.8) | -3.7 | (14.6) | 1.3 | (0.40) | 0.1 | (1.34) |
| Pernambuco | 350 | (15.7) | 380 | (12.6) | 371 | (14.6) | 353 | (14.9) | -4.7 | (12.5) | 1.3 | (0.37) | 0.2 | (1.51) |
| Piauí | 367 | (13.6) | 369 | (15.6) | 379 | (29.3) | 432 | (54.5) | 27.1 | (18.4) | 1.2 | (0.42) | 11.0 | (14.35) |
| Rio de Janeiro | 362 | (10.0) | 365 | (8.1) | 374 | (18.7) | 449 | (13.4) | 49.7 | (8.6) | 1.5 | (0.43) | 26.3 | (6.92) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | 366 | (14.3) | 361 | (13.5) | 372 | (32.0) | 428 | (24.7) | 28.6 | (10.0) | 1.1 | (0.35) | 9.2 | (6.01) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | 396 | (8.3) | 392 | (15.5) | 411 | (13.1) | 438 | (10.7) | 23.7 | (7.1) | 1.2 | (0.35) | 7.7 | (4.27) |
| Rondônia | 381 | (15.2) | 366 | (10.4) | 388 | (12.8) | 392 | (14.6) | 8.4 | (10.6) | 1.0 | (0.47) | 0.9 | (1.97) |
| Roraima | 344 | (8.8) | 349 | (13.3) | 360 | (11.9) | 395 | (15.8) | 38.4 | (6.3) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 16.5 | (5.30) |
| Santa Catarina | 426 | (11.0) | 408 | (19.4) | 394 | (28.1) | 419 | (27.7) | 9.6 | (15.1) | 0.5 | (0.20) | 1.0 | (3.42) |
| São Paulo | 395 | (8.5) | 381 | (7.6) | 393 | (19.8) | 443 | (19.7) | 30.4 | (8.3) | 1.0 | (0.21) | 8.5 | (4.06) |
| Sergipe | 390 | (11.3) | 404 | (28.2) | 368 | (15.1) | 377 | (23.7) | -4.3 | (13.5) | 0.7 | (0.27) | 0.3 | (2.72) |
| Tocantins | 350 | (11.8) | 354 | (11.8) | 348 | (10.8) | 410 | (20.2) | 44.1 | (11.0) | 1.2 | (0.29) | 16.2 | (6.92) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | 389 | (6.1) | 390 | (7.5) | 384 | (5.8) | 407 | (10.7) | 8.9 | (4.9) | 1.0 | (0.19) | 1.2 | (1.32) |
| Cali | 356 | (9.8) | 387 | (13.1) | 376 | (14.9) | 397 | (14.2) | 13.7 | (7.1) | 1.5 | (0.34) | 2.7 | (2.86) |
| Manizales | 392 | (6.2) | 382 | (9.4) | 409 | (13.3) | 434 | (10.8) | 21.0 | (6.8) | 1.1 | (0.26) | 7.0 | (4.04) |
| Medellin | 366 | (13.0) | 406 | (19.6) | 412 | (25.8) | 389 | (20.4) | 4.6 | (11.7) | 1.6 | (0.33) | 0.2 | (1.51) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 477 | (14.1) | 496 | (14.3) | 475 | (10.1) | 487 | (18.3) | -0.4 | (9.6) \| | 1.0 | (0.22) | 0.0 | (0.70) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi• | 393 | (4.9) | 400 | (8.2) | 438 | (8.6) | 455 | (13.0) | 20.2 | (6.1) | 1.5 | (0.22) | 4.9 | (2.83) |
| Ajman | 397 | (16.0) | 396 | (17.3) | 407 | (14.2) | 414 | (16.2) | 4.1 | (21.3) | 1.2 | (0.41) | 0.1 | (1.89) |
| Dubai* | 417 | (2.6) | 461 | (3.4) | 487 | (3.5) | 490 | (3.1) | 26.4 | (1.1) | 2.3 | (0.13) | 10.1 | (0.84) |
| Fujairah | 410 | (8.6) | 408 | (9.4) | 398 | (15.6) | 427 | (21.4) | 2.0 | (15.9) | 1.0 | (0.26) | 0.1 | (1.73) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | 404 | (12.0) | 403 | (13.2) | 413 | (15.0) | 442 | (9.6) | 19.3 | (7.2) | 1.2 | (0.30) | 4.2 | (3.04) |
| Sharjah | 414 | (14.2) | 435 | (15.5) | 441 | (21.6) | 468 | (15.9) | 18.6 | (12.3) | 1.7 | (0.41) | 2.6 | (3.34) |
| Umm Al Quwain | 398 | (12.7) | 392 | (11.8) | 420 | (10.7) | 382 | (5.4) | -12.6 | (3.3) | 1.2 | (0.32) | 2.3 | (1.20) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.4.3 for national data.

[Part 1/1]
School choice, by region
Table B2.IV. 17 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Percentag } \end{array}$ |  | of st | ents i | choo | whos | pa | al reported on the number of school | compe | ng fo | tuden | in th | ame a |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | One other school |  | No other schools |  |  |  | Two or more other schools |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { One other } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ |  | No other schools |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 85.9 | (0.8) | 10.5 | (0.7) | 3.6 | (0.4) | U | Alentejo | 36.9 | (11.0) | 36.0 | (13.7) | 27.1 | (10.1) |
| - New South Wales | 86.9 | (2.5) | 6.2 | (1.5) | 7.0 | (2.0) | - | Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northern territory | 55.4 | (3.5) | 37.0 | (3.1) | 7.6 | (1.7) |  | Andalusia* | 55.8 | (6.0) | 14.0 | (5.2) | 30.3 | (5.6) |
| Queensland | 91.6 | (1.9) | 3.9 | (1.7) | 4.5 | (1.7) |  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 62.8 | (6.7) | 19.5 | (6.5) | 17.7 | (5.1) |
| South Australia | 87.3 | (2.5) | 7.8 | (2.1) | 4.9 | (2.1) |  | Asturias* | 61.5 | (6.0) | 28.3 | (6.1) | 10.2 | (3.6) |
| Tasmania | 79.5 | (1.0) | 12.0 | (0.7) | 8.6 | (1.0) |  | Balearic Islands* | 56.6 | (7.1) | 22.0 | (5.7) | 21.4 | (5.8) |
| Victoria | 90.3 | (2.7) | 4.0 | (1.7) | 5.7 | (2.1) |  | Basque Country* | 75.0 | (3.1) | 18.4 | (2.8) | 6.6 | (1.9) |
| Western Australia | 89.7 | (2.9) | 7.5 | (2.7) | 2.8 | (1.2) |  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 70.6 | (4.5) | 13.4 | (3.5) | 16.0 | (3.8) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Castile and Leon* | 71.7 | (6.2) | 16.5 | (5.5) | 11.8 | (4.9) |
| Flemish community* | 85.1 | (2.9) | 10.4 | (2.4) | 4.5 | (1.8) |  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 72.2 | (5.0) | 11.8 | (5.0) | 16.0 | (4.3) |
| French community | 73.8 | (4.1) | 19.5 | (3.8) | 6.8 | (2.6) |  | Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 53.3 | (6.2) | 13.1 | (4.9) | 33.6 | (4.7) |
| German-speaking community | 60.6 | (0.2) | 24.7 | (0.1) | 14.6 | (0.3) |  | Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 59.3 | (4.8) | 17.5 | (5.2) | 23.2 | (5.1) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 69.2 | (0.5) | 19.2 | (0.4) | 11.7 | (0.6) |
| Alberta | 71.0 | (4.7) | 16.8 | (4.1) | 12.2 | (3.9) |  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 86.9 | (4.8) | 6.8 | (3.2) | 6.4 | (3.6) |
| British Columbia | 65.0 | (5.7) | 4.0 | (2.0) | 31.0 | (5.3) |  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 73.0 | (6.0) | 18.1 | (5.1) | 9.0 | (3.4) |
| Manitoba | 51.9 | (2.4) | 24.0 | (2.0) | 24.1 | (1.6) |  | Navarre* | 72.0 | (2.7) | 14.2 | (1.7) | 13.8 | (3.0) |
| New Brunswick | 29.8 | (1.7) | 5.8 | (0.9) | 64.4 | (1.8) |  | United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 2.9 | (1.1) | 4.3 | (0.8) | 92.8 | (0.6) |  | England | 85.3 | (2.8) | 9.3 | (2.3) | 5.4 | (1.8) |
| Nova Scotia | 23.1 | (4.0) | 20.0 | (4.3) | 56.9 | (7.3) |  | Northern Ireland | 95.0 | (2.5) | 2.4 | (1.8) | 2.6 | (1.8) |
| Ontario | 75.9 | (4.3) | 19.4 | (4.1) | 4.7 | (2.2) |  | Scotland ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 47.5 | (4.7) | 13.6 | (3.4) | 38.9 | (4.8) |
| Prince Edward Island | 2.7 | (0.2) | 19.9 | (0.2) | 77.3 | (0.3) |  | Wales | 76.9 | (3.5) | 13.1 | (2.4) | 10.0 | (2.6) |
| Quebec | 71.4 | (3.8) | 10.4 | (2.7) | 18.2 | (2.9) |  | United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saskatchewan | 49.8 | (2.8) | 12.5 | (2.5) | 37.7 | (3.3) |  | Connecticut ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 76.5 | (6.3) | 6.4 | (3.8) | 17.1 | (5.1) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Florida ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 54.8 | (6.1) | 17.9 | (4.7) | 27.3 | (6.2) |
| Abruzzo | 31.3 | (5.8) | 20.7 | (5.0) | 48.0 | (5.6) |  | Massachusetts* | 80.4 | (6.5) | 2.2 | (2.2) | 17.4 | (6.2) |
| Basilicata | 34.0 | (5.6) | 20.6 | (5.3) | 45.4 | (6.0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolzano | 24.7 | (0.6) | 30.9 | (0.9) | 44.3 | (0.8) | $\cdots$ | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Calabria | 22.0 | (6.0) | 23.9 | (6.5) | 54.1 | (8.1) | § | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 93.6 | (3.7) | 4.9 | (3.4) | 1.6 | (1.5) |
| Campania | 42.5 | (6.0) | 9.0 | (3.8) | 48.5 | (7.0) | \% | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emilia Romagna | 31.4 | (6.1) | 21.7 | (7.1) | 46.9 | (8.0) |  | Acre | 46.2 | (10.5) | 12.9 | (6.7) | 40.9 | (9.9) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 49.1 | (6.5) | 19.0 | (4.3) | 31.9 | (6.4) |  | Alagoas | 57.3 | (11.4) | 28.2 | (8.1) | 14.5 | (8.6) |
| Lazio | 24.6 | (5.8) | 26.4 | (4.9) | 49.1 | (6.9) |  | Amapá | 74.3 | (7.1) | 15.2 | (7.9) | 10.6 | (6.5) |
| Liguria | 38.5 | (6.1) | 24.1 | (5.4) | 37.3 | (6.4) |  | Amazonas | 62.0 | (6.2) | 20.7 | (6.9) | 17.4 | (6.3) |
| Lombardia | 47.9 | (6.9) | 31.8 | (7.2) | 20.3 | (6.9) |  | Bahia | 51.7 | (15.7) | 7.0 | (6.4) | 41.3 | (13.2) |
| Marche | 23.1 | (5.4) | 19.0 | (6.2) | 57.9 | (6.9) |  | Ceará | 44.8 | (9.8) | 34.5 | (8.8) | 20.7 | (9.0) |
| Molise | 17.1 | (0.7) | 22.0 | (0.7) | 61.0 | (0.9) |  | Espírito Santo | 46.2 | (8.6) | 19.2 | (5.6) | 34.7 | (9.2) |
| Piemonte | 34.5 | (7.2) | 19.9 | (6.1) | 45.6 | (7.1) |  | Federal District | 76.2 | (7.9) | 13.8 | (7.6) | 10.0 | (5.6) |
| Puglia | 34.4 | (8.1) | 22.1 | (7.7) | 43.5 | (6.1) |  | Goiás | 47.2 | (8.7) | 23.2 | (7.8) | 29.6 | (7.8) |
| Sardegna | 30.1 | (6.7) | 13.0 | (2.1) | 56.9 | (6.7) |  | Maranhão | 54.1 | (10.8) | 19.3 | (8.2) | 26.6 | (9.1) |
| Sicilia | 22.0 | (4.2) | 19.2 | (4.6) | 58.8 | (5.5) |  | Mato Grosso | 46.1 | (9.9) | 29.3 | (7.8) | 24.6 | (8.1) |
| Toscana | 37.1 | (6.6) | 16.3 | (3.8) | 46.6 | (6.1) |  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 79.8 | (7.3) | 20.2 | (7.3) | 0.0 | ) |
| Trento | 44.9 | (5.9) | 10.3 | (0.8) | 44.8 | (5.9) |  | Minas Gerais | 44.9 | (6.9) | 19.2 | (7.6) | 35.9 | (7.7) |
| Umbria | 24.0 | (4.9) | 23.3 | (4.2) | 52.7 | (6.0) |  | Pará | 28.1 | (7.6) | 24.2 | (10.5) | 47.6 | (13.3) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 3.2 | (0.3) | 30.1 | (1.0) | 66.7 | (1.0) |  | Paraíba | 35.5 | (10.1) | 48.7 | (11.7) | 15.8 | (7.5) |
| Veneto | 43.9 | (6.0) | 28.2 | (5.8) | 27.9 | (5.1) |  | Paraná | 52.8 | (10.5) | 15.8 | (7.4) | 31.3 | (10.5) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pernambuco | 47.1 | (9.9) | 43.0 | (12.9) | 9.9 | (7.2) |
| Aguascalientes | 78.0 | (4.2) | 13.4 | (2.3) | 8.6 | (4.3) |  | Piauí | 59.3 | (8.3) | 31.8 | (7.9) | 8.9 | (7.0) |
| Baja California | 80.3 | (9.1) | 11.3 | (8.6) | 8.4 | (2.1) |  | Rio de Janeiro | 62.3 | (10.7) | 12.2 | (7.0) | 25.6 | (9.2) |
| Baja California Sur | 55.0 | (7.9) | 14.7 | (6.6) | 30.2 | (8.4) |  | Rio Grande do Norte | 73.5 | (10.4) | 9.4 | (5.6) | 17.1 | (8.6) |
| Campeche | 58.1 | (8.8) | 23.3 | (7.3) | 18.6 | (6.3) |  | Rio Grande do Sul | 73.7 | (7.5) | 8.0 | (4.7) | 18.3 | (7.5) |
| Chiapas | 68.7 | (5.5) | 14.6 | (4.8) | 16.8 | (2.5) |  | Rondônia | 55.0 | (10.3) | 19.9 | (9.1) | 25.1 | (9.0) |
| Chihuahua | 62.1 | (9.2) | 21.1 | (8.1) | 16.9 | (4.9) |  | Roraima | 46.8 | (9.8) | 14.2 | (6.9) | 39.0 | (9.7) |
| Coahuila | 67.8 | (9.8) | 26.3 | (9.6) | 5.9 | (3.2) |  | Santa Catarina | 25.8 | (7.4) | 35.0 | (10.5) | 39.2 | (10.8) |
| Colima | 58.6 | (5.4) | 25.1 | (6.9) | 16.2 | (6.3) |  | São Paulo | 50.6 | (5.7) | 25.4 | (5.2) | 24.0 | (4.7) |
| Distrito Federal | 87.6 | (5.3) | 9.7 | (6.0) | 2.8 | (2.7) |  | Sergipe | 49.0 | (14.3) | 15.7 | (8.8) | 35.3 | (13.1) |
| Durango | 67.2 | (7.0) | 14.3 | (6.1) | 18.4 | (4.7) |  | Tocantins | 28.4 | (7.7) | 42.8 | (10.5) | 28.8 | (11.4) |
| Guanajuato | 53.8 | (8.6) | 28.1 | (7.7) | 18.1 | (6.3) |  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guerrero | 56.7 | (8.9) | 28.1 | (8.2) | 15.2 | (5.9) |  | Bogota | 90.0 | (4.4) | 1.7 | (1.2) | 8.3 | (4.2) |
| Hidalgo | 71.5 | (6.7) | 21.3 | (6.0) | 7.2 | (3.2) |  | Cali | 81.2 | (7.2) | 11.1 | (4.3) | 7.8 | (6.1) |
| Jalisco | 62.2 | (8.0) | 24.2 | (7.9) | 13.6 | (4.7) |  | Manizales | 63.1 | (8.6) | 20.8 | (7.9) | 16.1 | (5.2) |
| Mexico | 78.5 | (8.4) | 16.2 | (7.7) | 5.4 | (3.5) |  | Medellin | 85.7 | (5.2) | 7.2 | (4.2) | 7.1 | (4.2) |
| Morelos | 59.4 | (8.1) | 23.1 | (5.9) | 17.5 | (7.1) |  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nayarit | 61.6 | (6.9) | 15.4 | (6.3) | 23.0 | (4.5) |  | Perm Territory region* | 55.2 | (5.9) | 22.4 | (5.1) | 22.4 | (5.4) |
| Nuevo León | 80.2 | (6.8) | 7.3 | (3.8) | 12.5 | (5.7) |  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Puebla | 71.9 | (6.0) | 17.4 | (5.1) | 10.7 | (4.7) |  | Abu Dhabi• | 74.5 | (3.2) | 16.1 | (3.0) | 9.4 | (2.4) |
| Querétaro | 65.8 | (9.2) | 15.3 | (4.7) | 18.9 | (7.8) |  | Ajman | 83.0 | (7.8) | 17.0 | (7.8) | 0.0 | c |
| Quintana Roo | 59.6 | (7.7) | 25.2 | (7.7) | 15.2 | (5.4) |  | Dubai• | 80.6 | (0.3) | 13.2 | (0.3) | 6.2 | (0.1) |
| San Luis Potosí | 78.2 | (4.3) | 9.3 | (3.9) | 12.6 | (2.6) |  | Fujairah | 47.6 | (7.2) | 25.6 | (7.3) | 26.8 | (2.7) |
| Sinaloa | 64.0 | (6.8) | 15.9 | (6.7) | 20.1 | (5.9) |  | Ras Al Khaimah | 59.3 | (9.5) | 18.4 | (7.1) | 22.3 | (9.4) |
| Tabasco | 71.3 | (6.7) | 10.6 | (5.3) | 18.1 | (4.2) |  | Sharjah | 84.7 | (6.3) | 7.4 | (5.1) | 7.9 | (6.0) |
| Tamaulipas | 78.1 | (7.8) | 12.6 | (5.2) | 9.3 | (5.7) |  | Umm Al Quwain | 47.1 | (0.4) | 23.5 | (0.3) | 29.3 | (0.2) |
| Tlaxcala | 87.3 | (5.7) | 12.7 | (5.7) | 0.0 | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veracruz | 80.7 | (4.6) | 8.6 | (3.5) | 10.7 | (3.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yucatán | 75.3 | (6.5) | 13.1 | (5.3) | 11.6 | (4.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zacatecas | 59.6 | (5.6) | 12.9 | (3.0) | 27.5 | (5.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.4.4 for national data
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Table B2.IV. 18 Results based on school principals' reports


- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV. 4.7 for national data.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

StatLink 可ilा
[Part 2/4]
School type and performance in mathematics, reading and science, by region
Table B2.IV. 18 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Government or public schools ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Government-dependent private schools ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  | Government-independent private schools ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Mean score S.E. | Mean score S.E. | \% | S.E. | Mean <br> score S.E. | Mean score S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { score S.E. } \end{aligned}$ |
| - Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alentejo | 91.7 | (4.4) | 487 | 10.9)\| | 491 | (9.6) | 493 | (9.0) | 8.3 | 3 (4.4)\| | C c\| | c\| | c | 0.0 | . 0 | \| c c| | c c\| | c c |
| $\bigcirc$ Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 73.1 | (0.9) | 463 | (4.3) | 467 | (5.7) | 476 | (5.0) | 20.8 | 8 (3.6) | 486 (9.6) | 495 (8.4) | 504 (11.4) |  | . 3 (3.5) | C C | c c | c c |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 70.9 |  | 485 | (6.4) | 483 | (6.7) | 494 | (6.2) | 21.9 | 9 (4.6) | 512 (10.4) | 501 (14.2) | 513 (8.9) |  | . 3 (3.7) | c c | c c | c c |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 65.0 |  | 489 | (5.3) | 490 | (5.8) | 510 | (5.3) | 29.7 | 7 (5.0) | 517 (7.3) | 526 (8.5) | 527 (7.3) |  | . 3 (3.6) | c | c | c c |
| Balearic Islands* | 65.3 |  | 461 | (6.7) | 457 | (5.4) | 469 | (6.1) | 27.0 | (3.7) | 499 (7.9) | 505 (10.7) | 506 (8.2) |  | . 7 (2.9) | c c | c | c c |
| Basque Country* | 46.6 |  | 488 | (3.1) | 479 | (4.0) | 490 | (3.4) | 53.0 | (0.9) | 519 (3.9) | 514 (4.0) | 518 (3.6) |  | (0.4) | c c | c | c c |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 64.7 | (1.8) | 489 | (3.4) | 479 | (4.3) | 499 | (4.3) | 35.3 | 3 (1.8) | 497 (7.3) | 499 (5.4) | 505 (7.0) | 0.0 | 0 | c c | c | c |
| Castile and Leon* | 64.8 | (1.6) | 505 | (5.9) | 497 | (7.7) | 512 | (5.4) | 24.3 | 3 (4.7) | 521 (6.9) | 523 (7.6) | 535 (6.3) | 10.9 | (4.5) | 506 (8.7) | 512 (13.6) | 528 (11.6) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 62.6 | (2.9) | 477 | (7.2) | 487 | (6.8) | 479 | (6.1) | 27.6 | (3.8) | 518 (9.1) | 523 (6.5) | 513 (6.2) |  | 8 (3.5) | 523 (9.3) | 528 (14.7) | 512 (12.9) |
| Extremadura ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 79.7 | (1.7) | 451 | (5.3) | 446 | (5.5) | 472 | (5.5) | 18.3 | 3 (0.8) | 491 (8.4) | 486 (12.4) | 513 (6.0) | 2.0 | . 0 (2.0) | c | c c | c c |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 74.6 | (1.9) | 481 | (5.3) | 490 | (6.0) | 505 | (5.6) | 22.2 | 2 (3.1) | 506 (9.5) | 522 (9.0) | 526 (10.9) | 3.2 | . 2 (2.3) | c c | c c | c c |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 66.7 | (0.3) | 494 | (2.8) | 479 | (3.3) | 504 | (2.7) | 30.1 | 1 (0.3) | 518 (4.0) | 505 (3.8) | 517 (3.8) | 3.2 | (0.0) | c | c c | c |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 58.5 | (2.8) | 484 | (5.0) | 497 | (6.3) | 503 | (5.2) | 16.7 | (4.1) | 524 (8.9) | 523 (11.6) | 531 (9.7) | 24.8 | (4.4) | 535 (8.5) | 538 (9.4) | 542 (6.6) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 75.1 | (1.8) | 453 | (4.8) | 452 | (6.0) | 471 | (5.5) | 24.9 | (1.8) | 491 (13.1) | 493 (10.2) | 504 (10.2) | 0.0 | 0 | c | c | c c |
| Navarre* | 62.7 | (3.4) | 506 | (4.4) | 497 | (4.5) | 499 | (4.6) | 37.3 | (3.4) | 532 (5.0) | 527 (5.5) | 537 (4.7) | 0.0 | . 0 c | c | c | c c |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 48.2 | (3.6) | 485 | (5.1) | 492 | (5.8) | 508 | (5.8) | 43.1 | 1 (3.7) | 494 (7.7) | 498 (8.9) | 515 (8.1) | 8.7 | . 7 (0.9) | 570 (13.5) | 578 (12.6) | 593 (11.8) |
| Northern Ireland | 93.5 |  | 480 | (4.5) | 492 | (5.0) | 501 | (5.0) | 6.5 | 5 (3.0) | 532 (16.8) | 532 (18.8) | 555 (23.0) | 0.0 | . 0 | c | c c | c |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 94.3 |  | 495 | (2.7) | 503 | (3.0) | 510 | (3.1) | 0.0 | 0 | c | c | c |  | . 7 (0.2) | 553 (14.2) | 563 (15.7) | 573 (15.5) |
| Wales | 98.8 | (0.7) | 467 | (2.1) | 479 | (2.7) | 490 | (3.0) | 0.0 | c | c c | c c | c | 1.2 | . 2 (0.7) | c c | c | c |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 100.0 |  | 506 | (6.2) | 521 | (6.5) | 521 | (5.7) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0 | c c | c c | c |
| Florida* | 100.0 |  | 469 | (5.8) | 495 | (6.0) | 488 | (6.4) | 0.0 |  | c c | c c | c |  | . 0 | c c | c | c |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 100.0 |  | 514 | (6.2) | 527 | (6.1) | 527 | (6.0) | 0.0 | 0 | c c | c c | c | 0.0 | . 0 c | c c | c $\quad$ c | c c |

Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires• $56.4(5.5)|378(14.5)| 381(20.5)|379(17.9)| 27.0(5.3)|459(8.3)| 479(7.9)|470(10.3)| 16.6(6.5)|473(14.2)| 492(19.4) \mid 490(18.2)$ Brazil

Alagoas
Amapá
Amazonas
Bahia
Ceará
Espírito Santo
Federal District
Goiás
Maranhão
Mato Grosso
Mato Grosso do Su
Minas Gerais
Pará
Paraíba
Paraná
Pernambuco
Piauí
Rio de Janeiro
Rio Grande do Norte
Rio Grande do Sul
Rondônia
Roraima
Santa Catarina
São Paulo
Sergipe
Tocantins
Colombia
Bogota
Cali
Manizales
Medellin
Russian Federation
Perm Territory region
Abu Dhabi ${ }^{*}$
Ajman
Dubai
Fujairah
Ras Al Khaimah
Sharjah

- PISA adjudicated region

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.4.7 for national data.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

StatLink 可int http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 3/4]
School type and performance in mathematics, reading and science, by region
Table B2.IV. 18 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools (government-dependent and government-independent schools combined) |  | PISA index of economic, social and cultural status |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in performance on the mathematics scale between public and private schools after accounting for the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status of: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Public schools |  | Private schools (governmentdependent and governmentindependent) |  | Difference |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Stude |  |  |  | Stude and sch | hools |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |  |  | Mean index | S.E. |  |  | Mean index | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dif. } \\ \text { (Pub. - Priv.) } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. |
| - Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O Australian capital territory | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| O New South Wales | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Northern territory | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Queensland | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| South Australia | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Tasmania | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Victoria | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Western Australia | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w | w |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | W | w | W | W | w |  | W | W | W | W | W | w |
| French community | -29 | (14.4) | 0.02 | (0.1) | 0.11 | (0.1) | -0.09 | (0.1) | -24 | (10.0) | -19 | (7.3) |
| German-speaking community | -49 | (5.1) | 0.22 | (0.0) | 0.33 | (0.0) | -0.12 | (0.1) | -46 | (5.3) | -33 | (5.0) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | C | c | 0.52 | (0.0) | c | c | c | C |  | c | c | c |
| British Columbia | -33 | (13.3) | 0.43 | (0.0) | 0.71 | (0.2) | -0.27 | (0.2) | -24 | (10.5) | -17 | (9.4) |
| Manitoba | -69 | (17.2) | 0.20 | (0.0) | 1.01 | (0.2) | -0.81 | (0.2) | -38 | (12.4) | -16 | (9.6) |
| New Brunswick | c | c | 0.36 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c |  | c | c | c |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | c | c | 0.26 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Nova Scotia | 0 | (0.0) | 0.31 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | 0 | (0.0) | 0 | (0.0) |
| Ontario | c | c | 0.42 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Prince Edward Island | c | c | 0.33 | (0.0) | c | c | c | C | c | c |  | c |
| Quebec | -62 | (8.8) | 0.19 | (0.0) | 0.84 | (0.0) | -0.65 | (0.1) | -40 | (8.2) | -9 | (9.8) |
| Saskatchewan | -16 | (10.4) | 0.39 | (0.0) | 0.73 | (0.1) | -0.34 | (0.2) | -4 | (10.3) | -3 | (11.0) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | c | c | 0.03 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Basilicata | c | c | -0.23 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Bolzano | -11 | (7.8) | -0.08 | (0.0) | 0.54 | (0.1) | -0.62 | (0.1) | 7 | (8.4) | 60 | (7.9) |
| Calabria | c | c | -0.21 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Campania | c | c | -0.20 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Emilia Romagna | c | c | -0.01 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | C |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | c | c | 0.09 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Lazio | c | c | 0.16 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Liguria | -5 | (23.5) | 0.01 | (0.0) | 0.35 | (0.1) | -0.35 | (0.1) | 4 | (21.3) | 31 | (21.5) |
| Lombardia | -43 | (18.5) | -0.02 | (0.1) | 1.01 | (0.2) | -1.03 | (0.2) | -10 | (16.0) | 53 | (16.6) |
| Marche | c | c | -0.06 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Molise | 0 | (0.0) | -0.20 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | 0 | (0.0) | 0 | (0.0) |
| Piemonte | c | c | -0.08 | (0.0) | c | c | C | c | c | c | c | c |
| Puglia | c | c | -0.27 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Sardegna | c | c | -0.16 | (0.1) | c | c |  | c | c | c | c | c |
| Sicilia | 0 | (0.0) | -0.10 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | 0 | (0.0) | 0 | (0.0) |
| Toscana | c | c | -0.04 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Trento | 52 | (13.9) | 0.13 | (0.0) | -0.35 | (0.1) | 0.48 | (0.1) | 43 | (13.1) | 9 | (15.5) |
| Umbria | c | c | 0.08 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Valle d'Aosta | c | c | -0.18 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Veneto | 94 | (12.8) | -0.04 | (0.0) | -0.57 | (0.2) | 0.53 | (0.2) | 80 | (10.1) | 35 | (14.8) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | -16 | (22.0) | -0.91 | (0.1) | -0.17 | (0.3) | -0.73 | (0.3) | -1 | (17.1) | 20 | (14.3) |
| Baja California | 4 | (16.7) | -0.79 | (0.1) | 0.04 | (0.2) | -0.84 | (0.2) | 16 | (15.4) | 43 | (16.0) |
| Baja California Sur | c | c | -0.81 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Campeche | c | c | -1.39 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Chiapas | c | c | -1.82 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Chihuahua | -3 | (25.6) | -0.83 | (0.1) | -0.72 | (0.3) | -0.11 | (0.4) | 0 | (18.5) | 4 | (10.6) |
| Coahuila | -39 | (22.2) | -1.05 | (0.1) | 0.05 | (0.2) | -1.10 | (0.2) | -17 | (18.2) | 17 | (17.3) |
| Colima | c | c | -0.90 | (0.0) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Distrito Federal | -51 | (12.0) | -0.91 | (0.1) | 0.75 | (0.2) | -1.67 | (0.2) | -27 | (14.6) | 58 | (29.6) |
| Durango | c | c | -1.05 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Guanajuato | -42 | (16.1) | -1.58 | (0.1) | 0.21 | (0.3) | -1.79 | (0.3) | -3 | (15.5) | 44 | (19.7) |
| Guerrero | c | c | -1.70 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Hidalgo | c | c | -1.63 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Jalisco | c | c | -1.24 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | C | c | c | c |
| Mexico | -24 | (34.8) | -1.20 | (0.1) | 0.15 | (0.3) | -1.35 | (0.3) | -9 | (28.2) | 35 | (20.8) |
| Morelos | -56 | (33.4) | -1.23 | (0.1) | 0.34 | (0.3) | -1.57 | (0.3) | -20 | (26.8) | 31 | (22.8) |
| Nayarit | c | c | -1.10 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Nuevo León | -50 | (20.9) | -0.67 | (0.1) | 0.62 | (0.3) | -1.29 | (0.3) | -29 | (18.0) | 14 | (12.1) |
| Puebla | c | c | -1.72 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Querétaro | -42 | (18.3) | -1.18 | (0.2) | 0.55 | (0.2) | -1.72 | (0.3) | -14 | (19.9) | 14 | (21.8) |
| Quintana Roo | C | C | -1.13 | (0.1) | c | C | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | C | c | C | c | C |
| San Luis Potosí | -58 | (24.9) | -1.57 | (0.1) | 0.08 | (0.5) | -1.64 | (0.6) | -21 | (15.4) | 13 | (12.0) |
| Sinaloa | c | c | -1.00 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| Tabasco | C | c | -1.31 | (0.1) | c | c | C | c | c | c | C | c |
| Tamaulipas | -28 | (27.7) | -1.00 | (0.1) | 0.06 | (0.4) | -1.06 | (0.4) | -10 | (22.2) | 24 | (16.2) |
| Tlaxcala | -21 | (12.5) | -1.33 | (0.1) | 0.07 | (0.4) | -1.41 | (0.4) | 1 | (9.6) | 48 | (14.2) |
| Veracruz | -27 | (18.5) | -1.73 | (0.1) | 0.11 | (0.3) | -1.84 | (0.3) | 0 | (15.4) | 17 | (16.8) |
| Yucatán | -44 | (9.6) | -1.39 | (0.1) | 0.36 | (0.2) | -1.74 | (0.3) | -13 | (8.1) | 13 | (14.1) |
| Zacatecas | c | c | -1.24 | (0.1) | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV. 4.7 for national data.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.

[Part 4/4]
School type and performance in mathematics, reading and science, by region
Table B2.IV. 18 Results based on school principals' reports


- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.4.7 for national data.

1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.
2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies

[Part 1/1]
Use of achievement data for accountability purposes, by region
Table B2.IV. 21 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools that use achievement data in the following ways: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Posted publicly |  | Tracked over time by an administrative authority |  |  |  | Posted publicly |  | Tracked over time by an administrative authority |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  | 8 | Portugal |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 74.1 | (0.9) | 87.4 | (0.7) | U | Alentejo | 39.1 | (10.4) | 82.2 | (7.6) |
| - New South Wales | 65.6 | (4.0) | 90.1 | (2.2) |  | Spain |  |  |  |  |
| Northern territory | 68.0 | (2.9) | 83.3 | (2.2) |  | Andalusia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 20.3 | (5.4) | 80.5 | (6.2) |
| Queensland | 73.5 | (3.8) | 95.1 | (1.3) |  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 6.5 | (3.8) | 80.7 | (4.1) |
| South Australia | 49.9 | (5.0) | 77.9 | (4.2) |  | Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 7.5 | (2.7) | 77.0 | (6.5) |
| Tasmania | 50.4 | (1.6) | 87.0 | (1.5) |  | Balearic Islands* | 6.3 | (3.6) | 73.0 | (6.1) |
| Victoria | 74.7 | (3.6) | 94.0 | (2.2) |  | Basque Country ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 13.9 | (2.9) | 87.4 | (2.4) |
| Western Australia | 72.9 | (5.2) | 95.8 | (2.2) |  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 20.2 | (4.4) | 87.7 | (4.3) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  | Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 12.3 | (4.2) | 83.6 | (4.9) |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 1.7 | (0.9) | 63.7 | (3.5) |  | Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 10.9 | (4.5) | 94.5 | (3.2) |
| French community | 5.1 | (2.4) | 34.7 | (4.9) |  | Extremadura ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 17.0 | (4.9) | 66.8 | (8.1) |
| German-speaking community | 0.0 | c | 8.8 | (0.3) |  | Galicia* | 7.4 | (3.8) | 59.7 | (6.6) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  | La Rioja ${ }^{\circ}$ | 16.2 | (0.4) | 63.2 | (0.5) |
| Alberta | 70.8 | (5.0) | 97.6 | (1.1) |  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 18.2 | (5.3) | 94.4 | (3.4) |
| British Columbia | 59.5 | (6.4) | 95.0 | (3.1) |  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 13.3 | (5.3) | 65.2 | (6.0) |
| Manitoba | 10.4 | (1.6) | 74.1 | (3.1) |  | Navarre ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 24.9 | (3.5) | 79.0 | (4.6) |
| New Brunswick | 61.7 | (1.6) | 96.1 | (0.3) |  | United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 52.5 | (4.7) | 96.5 | (0.3) |  | England | 88.3 | (2.6) | 89.5 | (2.4) |
| Nova Scotia | 50.2 | (8.4) | 90.2 | (3.1) |  | Northern Ireland | 79.7 | (4.7) | 93.9 | (2.7) |
| Ontario | 73.8 | (4.9) | 95.3 | (1.2) |  | Scotland* | 82.9 | (4.1) | 87.8 | (3.1) |
| Prince Edward Island | 10.4 | (0.3) | 39.3 | (0.5) |  | Wales | 77.3 | (3.7) | 98.3 | (0.5) |
| Quebec | 52.3 | (4.2) | 88.8 | (2.5) |  | United States |  |  |  |  |
| Saskatchewan | 21.6 | (2.9) | 91.8 | (1.6) |  | Connecticut* | 98.2 | (1.8) | 98.2 | (1.8) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  | Florida ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 94.7 | (3.1) | 100.0 | c |
| Abruzzo | 30.6 | (5.1) | 25.6 | (7.1) |  | Massachusetts* | 94.7 | (3.1) | 98.1 | (1.9) |
| Basilicata | 23.8 | (4.7) | 24.0 | (4.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolzano | 14.1 | (0.5) | 49.5 | (0.9) |  | Argentina |  |  |  |  |
| Calabria | 28.6 | (5.6) | 14.7 | (4.4) | § | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires* | 15.8 | (6.2) | 66.2 | (7.1) |
| Campania | 28.8 | (5.7) | 36.5 | (8.0) | \% | Brazil |  |  |  |  |
| Emilia Romagna | 40.8 | (8.1) | 29.5 | (7.7) | 2 | Acre | 35.7 | (8.6) | 86.4 | (7.5) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 47.1 | (4.2) | 27.5 | (5.9) |  | Alagoas | 27.5 | (10.8) | 91.0 | (8.1) |
| Lazio | 36.5 | (7.3) | 37.5 | (7.4) |  | Amapá | 32.1 | (9.1) | 84.1 | (3.5) |
| Liguria | 38.7 | (6.2) | 16.9 | (6.4) |  | Amazonas | 48.4 | (11.4) | 98.2 | (1.8) |
| Lombardia | 53.2 | (5.7) | 34.2 | (7.6) |  | Bahia | 46.7 | (18.5) | 72.7 | (14.2) |
| Marche | 31.2 | (7.5) | 23.0 | (7.2) |  | Ceará | 47.1 | (12.4) | 98.3 | (1.3) |
| Molise | 2.6 | (0.2) | 22.1 | (0.8) |  | Espírito Santo | 41.6 | (9.1) | 100.0 | c |
| Piemonte | 61.8 | (5.8) | 26.5 | (5.1) |  | Federal District | 37.7 | (11.9) | 91.4 | (6.0) |
| Puglia | 36.8 | (7.6) | 21.9 | (6.5) |  | Goiás | 36.1 | (10.8) | 89.1 | (7.2) |
| Sardegna | 45.9 | (7.7) | 27.0 | (7.5) |  | Maranhão | 29.7 | (12.3) | 91.1 | (5.6) |
| Sicilia | 32.9 | (6.5) | 32.6 | (7.0) |  | Mato Grosso | 23.9 | (7.2) | 92.4 | (5.8) |
| Toscana | 38.5 | (8.0) | 30.2 | (7.1) |  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 29.1 | (9.0) | 93.7 | (6.2) |
| Trento | 45.5 | (4.3) | 29.2 | (3.6) |  | Minas Gerais | 39.2 | (10.6) | 100.0 | c |
| Umbria | 34.5 | (5.0) | 32.1 | (6.4) |  | Pará | 21.6 | (13.2) | 74.3 | (11.9) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 35.6 | (1.0) | 43.7 | (1.0) |  | Paraíba | 37.0 | (13.8) | 93.9 | (2.0) |
| Veneto | 47.0 | (7.3) | 26.1 | (7.2) |  | Paraná | 19.3 | (7.4) | 87.5 | (5.1) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  | Pernambuco | 28.4 | (8.8) | 94.4 | (5.5) |
| Aguascalientes | 38.5 | (7.7) | 93.0 | (2.4) |  | Piauí | 40.5 | (9.8) | 91.5 | (6.1) |
| Baja California | 57.1 | (8.9) | 99.8 | (0.2) |  | Rio de Janeiro | 58.4 | (11.0) | 96.6 | (3.8) |
| Baja California Sur | 41.2 | (6.4) | 95.1 | (1.7) |  | Rio Grande do Norte | 17.5 | (7.9) | 82.8 | (8.8) |
| Campeche | 44.6 | (9.7) | 95.5 | (2.2) |  | Rio Grande do Sul | 13.3 | (7.2) | 84.9 | (7.0) |
| Chiapas | 39.6 | (8.8) | 94.0 | (3.0) |  | Rondônia | 33.5 | (6.9) | 81.9 | (9.0) |
| Chihuahua | 41.4 | (9.5) | 96.0 | (2.3) |  | Roraima | 16.7 | (8.1) | 97.5 | (2.4) |
| Coahuila | 29.7 | (7.9) | 98.9 | (1.2) |  | Santa Catarina | 17.8 | (8.1) | 70.4 | (10.1) |
| Colima | 29.3 | (6.0) | 85.9 | (3.0) |  | São Paulo | 58.2 | (6.4) | 97.9 | (1.4) |
| Distrito Federal | 59.1 | (9.2) | 94.3 | (4.7) |  | Sergipe | 46.0 | (11.1) | 93.3 | (5.1) |
| Durango | 35.9 | (7.0) | 85.2 | (10.2) |  | Tocantins | 33.8 | (9.9) | 96.0 | (4.0) |
| Guanajuato | 33.3 | (7.4) | 96.9 | (1.9) |  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |
| Guerrero | 49.5 | (8.6) | 86.8 | (6.9) |  | Bogota | 53.8 | (7.5) | 83.0 | (4.2) |
| Hidalgo | 46.2 | (8.7) | 95.3 | (3.2) |  | Cali | 44.9 | (8.9) | 89.1 | (4.4) |
| Jalisco | 30.3 | (9.2) | 91.1 | (3.7) |  | Manizales | 49.2 | (9.5) | 82.8 | (6.8) |
| Mexico | 51.6 | (7.9) | 99.8 | (0.2) |  | Medellin | 52.4 | (7.8) | 87.2 | (4.3) |
| Morelos | 47.6 | (6.8) | 96.0 | (3.1) |  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |
| Nayarit | 29.7 | (5.9) | 87.1 | (4.0) |  | Perm Territory region ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 86.9 | (4.7) | 100.0 | c |
| Nuevo León | 39.4 | (9.8) | 88.6 | (4.7) |  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |
| Puebla | 37.2 | (8.2) | 90.0 | (4.6) |  | Abu Dhabi* | 45.3 | (4.4) | 91.2 | (2.8) |
| Querétaro | 28.9 | (8.0) | 93.8 | (5.6) |  | Ajman | 54.6 | (6.6) | 94.0 | (6.0) |
| Quintana Roo | 43.4 | (9.9) | 96.0 | (1.7) |  | Dubai ${ }^{-}$ | 45.9 | (0.3) | 94.4 | (0.1) |
| San Luis Potosí | 37.8 | (6.7) | 91.1 | (3.3) |  | Fujairah | 39.4 | (7.9) | 94.3 | (5.3) |
| Sinaloa | 37.0 | (7.7) | 97.0 | (1.9) |  | Ras Al Khaimah | 47.2 | (9.5) | 96.7 | (3.4) |
| Tabasco | 31.2 | (7.1) | 91.9 | (3.6) |  | Sharjah | 50.1 | (10.6) | 84.6 | (7.7) |
| Tamaulipas | 38.7 | (9.7) | 89.0 | (9.1) |  | Umm Al Quwain | 48.4 | (0.4) | 99.3 | (0.2) |
| Tlaxcala | 40.6 | (7.7) | 98.0 | (1.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veracruz | 44.0 | (8.5) | 79.3 | (5.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yucatán | 47.6 | (7.2) | 89.9 | (4.4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zacatecas | 37.9 | (7.1) | 96.2 | (1.9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.4.31 for national data.
StatLink ज्ताड़ाए http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 1/2]
Quality assurance and school improvement, by region
Table B2.IV. 22 Results based on school principals' reports

|  | Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that their schools have the following measures aimed at quality assurance and improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Writtenspecificationof theschool'scurriculumandeducationalgoals |  | Written specification of studentperformance standards |  | Systematic <br> recording of data, <br> including teacher <br> and student <br> attendance and <br> graduation rates, <br> test results and <br> professional <br> development <br> of teachers |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Internal } \\ \text { evaluation/ } \\ \text { self-evaluation } \end{gathered}$ |  | External evaluation |  | Seeking written feedback from students <br> (e.g. regarding lessons, teachers or resources) |  | Teacher mentoring |  | Regularconsultationwith one ormore expertsover a periodof at least sixmonths withthe aimof improvingthe school |  | Implementation ofa standardised policy for mathematics (i.e. school curriculum with shared instructional materials accompanied by staff development and training) |  |
|  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| $\square$ Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian capital territory | 99.8 | (0.1) | 95.9 | (0.3) | 100.0 | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 94.7 | (0.5) | 94.7 | (0.4) | 73.9 | (1.0) | 97.9 | (0.3) | 59.8 | (1.1) | 89.9 | (0.7) |
| O New South Wales | 98.2 | (0.9) | 90.7 | (2.2) | 99.0 | (0.7) | 95.8 | (1.6) | 68.4 | (3.7) | 68.8 | (3.4) | 93.3 | (1.8) | 69.0 | (3.6) | 71.1 | (3.8) |
| Northern territory | 98.5 | (1.3) | 98.6 | (0.5) | 96.7 | (0.7) | 79.4 | (6.0) | 70.5 | (5.5) | 40.1 | (9.8) | 94.0 | (0.7) | 75.2 | (9.6) | 61.6 | (3.4) |
| Queensland | 96.5 | (1.6) | 93.8 | (2.2) | 98.0 | (1.1) | 91.9 | (2.3) | 67.1 | (3.8) | 61.0 | (4.3) | 91.4 | (2.5) | 73.9 | (4.1) | 86.7 | (3.1) |
| South Australia | 93.9 | (2.7) | 89.1 | (3.2) | 91.3 | (3.2) | 97.8 | (1.4) | 65.8 | (4.9) | 72.2 | (5.0) | 83.5 | (4.3) | 70.0 | (5.3) | 75.2 | (4.6) |
| Tasmania | 97.4 | (0.7) | 86.9 | (2.0) | 96.5 | (0.2) | 92.9 | (0.6) | 46.9 | (1.7) | 53.3 | (2.3) | 96.4 | (0.7) | 64.5 | (1.4) | 90.9 | (1.7) |
| Victoria | 96.9 | (1.6) | 88.8 | (2.5) | 98.5 | (1.0) | 94.9 | (2.0) | 73.3 | (3.8) | 83.4 | (3.4) | 95.1 | (1.6) | 79.1 | (3.6) | 74.6 | (3.6) |
| Western Australia | 91.0 | (3.4) | 83.2 | (4.4) | 99.5 | (0.6) | 93.9 | (2.7) | 75.2 | (4.7) | 55.6 | (4.4) | 89.7 | (2.8) | 66.8 | (5.6) | 75.9 | (4.8) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 84.2 | (2.9) | 53.6 | (4.2) | 93.6 | (1.8) | 90.3 | (2.1) | 63.7 | (3.8) | 52.3 | (4.3) | 95.1 | (1.7) | 52.1 | (4.0) | 40.6 | (3.7) |
| French community | 79.9 | (3.9) | 41.8 | (5.2) | 54.1 | (4.9) | 64.3 | (5.4) | 76.7 | (4.3) | 13.0 | (3.5) | 37.7 | (5.7) | 23.0 | (5.0) | 43.4 | (5.2) |
| German-speaking community | 83.1 | (0.2) | 22.2 | (0.3) | 66.9 | (0.3) | 72.9 | (0.4) | 85.1 | (0.3) | 23.5 | (0.2) | 100.0 | c | 66.0 | (0.4) | 77.0 | (0.3) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 94.9 | (2.3) | 91.9 | (2.8) | 91.9 | (2.8) | 90.9 | (2.8) | 77.7 | (4.7) | 65.0 | (4.7) | 89.9 | (2.9) | 78.3 | (4.7) | 90.7 | (3.1) |
| British Columbia | 94.0 | (1.2) | 89.9 | (4.0) | 87.0 | (4.4) | 71.5 | (5.6) | 48.9 | (5.5) | 49.2 | (4.9) | 81.3 | (5.0) | 48.6 | (6.0) | 69.2 | (6.1) |
| Manitoba | 87.7 | (2.7) | 65.0 | (3.3) | 84.4 | (2.8) | 92.4 | (2.0) | 62.4 | (2.9) | 66.7 | (3.3) | 90.1 | (1.7) | 48.9 | (3.2) | 80.2 | (2.7) |
| New Brunswick | 93.8 | (0.3) | 89.6 | (0.5) | 82.4 | (1.4) | 79.0 | (1.4) | 89.7 | (1.1) | 51.3 | (2.2) | 79.5 | (1.2) | 66.9 | (1.9) | 94.5 | (0.3) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 94.6 | (1.6) | 84.7 | (3.3) | 94.6 | (5.5) | 98.4 | (0.4) | 94.4 | (1.4) | 50.6 | (3.0) | 87.8 | (3.2) | 66.7 | (3.8) | 90.8 | (3.2) |
| Nova Scotia | 92.2 | (3.6) | 77.0 | (4.9) | 90.2 | (3.2) | 97.8 | (0.4) | 81.8 | (4.4) | 44.8 | (7.2) | 90.2 | (1.5) | 90.0 | (3.2) | 85.7 | (3.8) |
| Ontario | 97.1 | (1.9) | 90.5 | (3.2) | 94.8 | (2.3) | 89.2 | (3.3) | 74.9 | (4.2) | 38.8 | (5.2) | 93.8 | (2.3) | 90.3 | (2.8) | 85.9 | (3.6) |
| Prince Edward Island | 67.9 | (0.5) | 73.6 | (0.4) | 60.4 | (0.4) | 85.4 | (0.3) | 68.9 | (0.4) | 52.5 | (0.4) | 96.3 | (0.2) | 80.7 | (0.3) | 71.0 | (0.4) |
| Quebec | 92.5 | (2.3) | 78.3 | (3.9) | 84.0 | (3.2) | 61.5 | (4.3) | 33.7 | (3.5) | 23.9 | (3.6) | 72.4 | (4.0) | 38.4 | (3.6) | 68.0 | (3.8) |
| Saskatchewan | 98.4 | (0.2) | 61.6 | (3.7) | 85.6 | (2.8) | 80.7 | (3.1) | 50.0 | (3.6) | 51.8 | (3.6) | 81.9 | (4.0) | 70.5 | (2.8) | 81.2 | (3.4) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 97.4 | (2.6) | 84.1 | (2.8) | 38.4 | (7.1) | 74.7 | (5.4) | 25.0 | (6.0) | 47.1 | (4.7) | 76.8 | (3.3) | 18.1 | (5.3) | 46.9 | (6.3) |
| Basilicata | 94.0 | (3.2) | 93.5 | (2.2) | 43.8 | (4.0) | 64.4 | (5.1) | 15.9 | (2.5) | 29.4 | (3.2) | 75.0 | (5.2) | 16.7 | (5.6) | 36.9 | (5.3) |
| Bolzano | 86.0 | (0.5) | 50.5 | (0.8) | 73.1 | (1.0) | 95.6 | (0.2) | 54.5 | (0.8) | 70.2 | (0.6) | 97.1 | (0.2) | 40.5 | (0.7) | 61.2 | (0.8) |
| Calabria | 97.7 | (2.3) | 87.4 | (5.2) | 77.1 | (5.9) | 87.5 | (5.0) | 27.2 | (6.5) | 43.1 | (7.7) | 84.1 | (5.9) | 26.6 | (6.9) | 54.1 | (7.4) |
| Campania | 100.0 | c | 97.2 | (2.2) | 42.0 | (7.0) | 71.7 | (8.8) | 29.8 | (7.1) | 34.3 | (6.8) | 84.2 | (5.0) | 12.0 | (4.2) | 59.4 | (7.3) |
| Emilia Romagna | 100.0 | c | 75.6 | (7.6) | 48.8 | (7.9) | 64.7 | (8.4) | 18.8 | (5.8) | 37.1 | (7.8) | 89.2 | (4.6) | 21.5 | (5.7) | 54.7 | (8.1) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 98.0 | (1.9) | 77.7 | (5.4) | 29.2 | (5.4) | 59.0 | (5.6) | 23.2 | (4.0) | 45.9 | (5.7) | 83.7 | (2.2) | 22.7 | (6.5) | 42.3 | (5.4) |
| Lazio | 96.0 | (2.9) | 92.6 | (3.7) | 58.1 | (8.4) | 74.1 | (7.0) | 33.8 | (7.5) | 37.5 | (7.2) | 69.6 | (5.0) | 22.6 | (6.7) | 57.5 | (8.7) |
| Liguria | 96.8 | (2.7) | 79.9 | (5.9) | 30.4 | (7.9) | 66.5 | (6.8) | 24.8 | (7.3) | 33.6 | (6.8) | 75.4 | (6.5) | 24.8 | (6.6) | 42.5 | (6.3) |
| Lombardia | 100.0 |  | 79.5 | (7.6) | 50.0 | (7.9) | 83.6 | (5.1) | 61.0 | (7.4) | 49.9 | (7.6) | 81.2 | (6.0) | 26.5 | (6.9) | 76.6 | (6.7) |
| Marche | 99.7 | (0.3) | 78.9 | (6.8) | 53.5 | (7.6) | 81.0 | (6.4) | 36.5 | (7.6) | 48.7 | (6.8) | 72.1 | (6.9) | 33.3 | (6.8) | 68.3 | (5.9) |
| Molise | 98.0 | (0.2) | 81.1 | (0.7) | 74.5 | (0.8) | 61.2 | (0.9) | 10.0 | (0.6) | 29.8 | (1.1) | 87.3 | (0.6) | 21.1 | (0.6) | 39.7 | (0.9) |
| Piemonte | 96.2 | (2.7) | 92.0 | (3.9) | 49.9 | (6.8) | 80.8 | (5.5) | 25.5 | (7.1) | 51.9 | (8.3) | 72.4 | (6.9) | 23.2 | (5.8) | 47.0 | (6.9) |
| Puglia | 98.0 | (2.0) | 86.2 | (4.4) | 63.2 | (6.9) | 81.0 | (5.7) | 35.1 | (7.3) | 47.9 | (6.6) | 74.7 | (7.7) | 10.4 | (4.6) | 47.2 | (8.2) |
| Sardegna | 99.6 | (0.4) | 83.5 | (6.0) | 57.4 | (8.0) | 60.0 | (8.7) | 25.6 | (6.3) | 27.5 | (7.3) | 66.9 | (7.5) | 9.6 | (3.7) | 40.3 | (7.2) |
| Sicilia | 100.0 | c | 89.0 | (4.7) | 62.3 | (6.6) | 84.5 | (5.1) | 25.4 | (6.8) | 33.7 | (6.3) | 74.0 | (7.5) | 34.5 | (7.0) | 54.6 | (7.8) |
| Toscana | 96.3 | (2.8) | 75.2 | (6.9) | 46.8 | (7.4) | 62.3 | (7.4) | 31.8 | (7.9) | 33.7 | (6.9) | 69.0 | (7.4) | 23.3 | (5.7) | 47.2 | (8.8) |
| Trento | 95.9 | (1.4) | 55.0 | (4.6) | 48.2 | (4.3) | 86.2 | (3.7) | 29.6 | (5.4) | 44.1 | (3.8) | 81.3 | (2.6) | 28.3 | (3.8) | 70.8 | (4.7) |
| Umbria | 91.7 | (4.3) | 81.9 | (4.4) | 51.0 | (6.3) | 66.7 | (6.4) | 26.5 | (5.6) | 28.0 | (4.9) | 70.1 | (5.3) | 20.9 | (3.9) | 50.5 | (5.1) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 97.7 | (0.3) | 82.3 | (0.8) | 41.0 | (1.0) | 80.2 | (0.9) | 30.2 | (1.0) | 33.3 | (1.0) | 65.9 | (0.9) | 29.0 | (0.8) | 34.6 | (1.0) |
| Veneto | 99.5 | (0.5) | 76.7 | (6.6) | 52.9 | (6.8) | 75.8 | (6.1) | 32.9 | (6.8) | 30.2 | (7.3) | 76.1 | (6.9) | 30.9 | (5.7) | 54.2 | (7.4) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 94.4 | (3.8) | 83.1 | (5.8) | 99.0 | (0.9) | 95.0 | (0.3) | 78.4 | (5.2) | 80.2 | (6.2) | 44.3 | (6.8) | 47.9 | (6.9) | 61.4 | (7.3) |
| Baja California | 96.5 | (3.3) | 78.2 | (7.0) | 84.7 | (7.9) | 92.8 | (4.8) | 92.0 | (4.4) | 66.8 | (6.5) | 58.4 | (11.9) | 56.1 | (6.4) | 86.4 | (7.4) |
| Baja California Sur | 96.3 | (2.7) | 80.5 | (4.7) | 99.3 | (0.7) | 90.0 | (5.6) | 74.6 | (4.9) | 82.3 | (7.7) | 50.0 | (6.4) | 56.7 | (7.2) | 78.4 | (6.3) |
| Campeche | 86.0 | (6.0) | 80.4 | (5.2) | 100.0 | c | 96.6 | (2.4) | 71.1 | (5.5) | 85.2 | (5.9) | 43.6 | (8.0) | 46.8 | (9.3) | 60.7 | (6.6) |
| Chiapas | 88.0 | (3.7) | 82.4 | (6.1) | 93.6 | (3.3) | 94.6 | (1.4) | 74.0 | (8.6) | 68.4 | (8.4) | 49.4 | (7.6) | 66.5 | (5.2) | 68.6 | (6.7) |
| Chihuahua | 94.4 | (3.6) | 85.0 | (6.4) | 97.7 | (1.9) | 100.0 | c | 75.1 | (9.9) | 75.2 | (8.3) | 76.9 | (7.2) | 62.1 | (9.2) | 84.4 | (5.2) |
| Coahuila | 89.9 | (5.4) | 84.0 | (6.6) | 99.1 | (0.6) | 96.3 | (3.7) | 67.2 | (7.6) | 82.5 | (7.2) | 55.4 | (9.0) | 52.5 | (8.4) | 66.1 | (9.4) |
| Colima | 85.1 | (4.1) | 75.8 | (6.5) | 84.6 | (4.1) | 74.3 | (2.5) | 62.8 | (5.6) | 69.6 | (4.4) | 55.5 | (7.2) | 45.9 | (5.9) | 70.3 | (6.8) |
| Distrito Federal | 93.1 | (3.5) | 89.3 | (5.9) | 97.6 | (2.0) | 95.0 | (3.3) | 84.9 | (6.3) | 82.2 | (7.5) | 57.7 | (9.9) | 59.4 | (9.7) | 66.2 | (9.0) |
| Durango | 97.8 | (1.9) | 67.4 | (9.6) | 96.6 | (2.6) | 93.8 | (4.9) | 93.8 | (3.3) | 82.5 | (6.0) | 53.1 | (9.1) | 51.6 | (7.9) | 62.6 | (9.8) |
| Guanajuato | 91.2 | (5.8) | 87.6 | (4.8) | 89.6 | (3.7) | 98.0 | (2.0) | 76.9 | (6.6) | 75.1 | (7.9) | 48.8 | (8.9) | 32.0 | (7.1) | 62.9 | (6.7) |
| Guerrero | 83.2 | (7.6) | 77.5 | (8.2) | 92.1 | (5.6) | 90.3 | (7.0) | 68.3 | (10.3) | 62.3 | (9.8) | 57.9 | (10.2) | 42.7 | (8.8) | 77.5 | (6.9) |
| Hidalgo | 94.9 | (2.6) | 90.1 | (4.7) | 94.1 | (3.1) | 87.4 | (3.9) | 79.3 | (6.7) | 77.9 | (7.2) | 37.6 | (7.5) | 40.8 | (7.4) | 62.4 | (7.8) |
| Jalisco | 98.1 | (1.9) | 81.8 | (7.2) | 97.3 | (1.9) | 94.8 | (2.9) | 82.5 | (4.7) | 71.9 | (9.5) | 50.1 | (9.5) | 42.9 | (7.4) | 73.0 | (7.8) |
| Mexico | 98.8 | (0.7) | 75.4 | (8.3) | 93.2 | (3.9) | 100.0 | c | 55.2 | (7.8) | 64.5 | (7.0) | 41.8 | (7.3) | 54.0 | (6.0) | 64.4 | (6.0) |
| Morelos | 83.5 | (5.8) | 87.5 | (5.5) | 91.9 | (4.7) | 86.0 | (4.8) | 66.4 | (7.5) | 74.6 | (8.0) | 60.8 | (7.1) | 64.1 | (8.2) | 71.8 | (7.0) |
| Nayarit | 78.0 | (5.2) | 75.1 | (4.7) | 86.1 | (4.8) | 81.4 | (5.0) | 85.2 | (4.1) | 72.9 | (6.4) | 55.9 | (5.9) | 43.9 | (7.4) | 58.3 | (5.7) |
| Nuevo León | 100.0 |  | 97.1 | (2.3) | 93.3 | (5.5) | 91.2 | (5.8) | 92.6 | (3.7) | 83.6 | (7.4) | 72.0 | (8.6) | 63.4 | (7.7) | 85.1 | (6.6) |
| Puebla | 92.5 | (4.0) | 82.9 | (4.7) | 95.1 | (2.4) | 94.5 | (3.5) | 74.9 | (6.3) | 69.6 | (6.5) | 57.2 | (7.7) | 46.3 | (7.4) | 69.6 | (6.3) |
| Querétaro | 97.8 | (2.3) | 86.3 | (5.9) | 91.4 | (5.4) | 90.8 | (5.5) | 69.4 | (8.0) | 68.6 | (12.8) | 55.6 | (6.9) | 41.6 | (10.8) | 53.4 | (12.2) |
| Quintana Roo | 91.4 | (4.9) | 78.2 | (7.8) | 98.7 | (0.9) | 86.3 | (7.5) | 77.9 | (7.4) | 75.4 | (7.0) | 44.0 | (8.3) | 53.2 | (7.4) | 62.4 | (8.5) |
| San Luis Potosí | 96.2 | (2.3) | 88.7 | (4.2) | 92.7 | (3.0) | 95.4 | (3.3) | 83.1 | (5.4) | 75.4 | (7.1) | 72.0 | (5.1) | 56.5 | (7.7) | 65.8 | (8.9) |
| Sinaloa | 90.1 | (5.1) | 82.4 | (5.3) | 100.0 | c | 98.1 | (1.3) | 78.8 | (6.8) | 85.5 | (5.8) | 61.8 | (7.8) | 65.1 | (7.9) | 68.7 | (7.3) |
| Tabasco | 88.3 | (6.0) | 85.7 | (6.7) | 92.9 | (3.6) | 92.7 | (5.1) | 71.9 | (8.1) | 68.4 | (8.0) | 53.0 | (9.9) | 59.6 | (8.9) | 66.4 | (6.5) |
| Tamaulipas | 90.6 | (5.3) | 76.6 | (10.1) | 89.5 | (8.8) | 96.3 | (2.7) | 56.1 | (11.3) | 71.0 | (10.9) | 71.1 | (9.2) | 74.5 | (8.1) | 80.1 | (4.1) |
| Tlaxcala | 91.7 | (3.8) | 75.3 | (7.6) | 96.4 | (1.9) | 95.9 | (2.6) | 87.5 | (5.3) | 89.7 | (3.6) | 56.2 | (8.3) | 55.0 | (7.5) | 76.1 | (6.1) |
| Veracruz | 85.5 | (6.6) | 82.5 | (7.0) | 99.4 | (0.6) | 93.4 | (3.1) | 77.3 | (6.2) | 66.9 | (7.5) | 49.9 | (8.1) | 48.0 | (8.4) | 55.4 | (8.0) |
| Yucatán | 96.1 | (3.3) | 88.7 | (5.1) | 93.6 | (3.2) | 88.3 | (5.3) | 70.7 | (9.2) | 58.5 | (9.0) | 64.1 | (8.3) | 44.2 | (8.6) | 72.4 | (7.1) |
| Zacatecas | 87.2 | (6.8) | 76.9 | (7.9) | 92.0 | (2.5) | 89.8 | (2.6) | 58.9 | (7.9) | 58.2 | (6.9) | 36.2 | (7.2) | 42.1 | (6.4) | 62.2 | (6.5) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.4.32 for national data.
StatLink 司itisu http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 2/2]
Quality assurance and school improvement, by region
Table B2.IV. 22 Results based on school principals' reports


- PISA adjudicated region.

Note: See Table IV.4.32 for national data.
StatLink (-nilst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 24 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Index of disciplinary climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Australian capital territory | -0.26 | (0.05) | -1.55 | (0.07) | -0.57 | (0.05) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 1.07 | (0.07) | 1.04 | (0.03) |
| - New South Wales | -0.16 | (0.03) | -1.52 | (0.04) | -0.51 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.04) | 1.21 | (0.04) | 1.07 | (0.02) |
| Northern territory | -0.11 | (0.11) | -1.29 | (0.15) | -0.37 | (0.11) | 0.22 | (0.12) | 1.03 | (0.11) | 0.92 | (0.05) |
| Queensland | -0.13 | (0.03) | -1.48 | (0.05) | -0.42 | (0.03) | 0.19 | (0.03) | 1.21 | (0.05) | 1.05 | (0.02) |
| South Australia | -0.14 | (0.04) | -1.38 | (0.06) | -0.45 | (0.05) | 0.14 | (0.04) | 1.13 | (0.05) | 0.99 | (0.02) |
| Tasmania | -0.19 | (0.04) | -1.44 | (0.05) | -0.51 | (0.05) | 0.12 | (0.04) | 1.06 | (0.05) | 0.99 | (0.02) |
| Victoria | -0.14 | (0.04) | -1.37 | (0.04) | -0.46 | (0.04) | 0.17 | (0.03) | 1.12 | (0.05) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Western Australia | -0.06 | (0.03) | -1.35 | (0.05) | -0.32 | (0.04) | 0.25 | (0.04) | 1.20 | (0.05) | 1.01 | (0.02) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community ${ }^{*}$ | 0.08 | (0.03) | -1.17 | (0.04) | -0.26 | (0.02) | 0.39 | (0.04) | 1.37 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.02) |
| French community | -0.16 | (0.03) | -1.52 | (0.04) | -0.51 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.04) | 1.21 | (0.04) | 1.07 | (0.02) |
| German-speaking community | -0.14 | (0.04) | -1.37 | (0.04) | -0.46 | (0.04) | 0.17 | (0.03) | 1.12 | (0.05) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 0.04 | (0.04) | -1.19 | (0.06) | -0.22 | (0.03) | 0.33 | (0.06) | 1.27 | (0.04) | 0.97 | (0.02) |
| British Columbia | 0.02 | (0.03) | -1.19 | (0.05) | -0.24 | (0.03) | 0.33 | (0.04) | 1.18 | (0.04) | 0.94 | (0.02) |
| Manitoba | 0.03 | (0.04) | -1.17 | (0.05) | -0.26 | (0.03) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 1.28 | (0.04) | 0.96 | (0.02) |
| New Brunswick | -0.04 | (0.04) | -1.28 | (0.07) | -0.27 | (0.03) | 0.26 | (0.04) | 1.13 | (0.06) | 0.96 | (0.03) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | -0.08 | (0.04) | -1.44 | (0.06) | -0.40 | (0.04) | 0.26 | (0.05) | 1.28 | (0.04) | 1.06 | (0.03) |
| Nova Scotia | -0.09 | (0.06) | -1.48 | (0.07) | -0.37 | (0.07) | 0.27 | (0.05) | 1.23 | (0.08) | 1.06 | (0.03) |
| Ontario | -0.02 | (0.03) | -1.21 | (0.04) | -0.31 | (0.02) | 0.22 | (0.03) | 1.22 | (0.04) | 0.95 | (0.02) |
| Prince Edward Island | -0.12 | (0.03) | -1.36 | (0.06) | -0.37 | (0.04) | 0.14 | (0.03) | 1.11 | (0.05) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Quebec | 0.05 | (0.03) | -1.20 | (0.03) | -0.30 | (0.03) | 0.38 | (0.05) | 1.33 | (0.04) | 0.99 | (0.01) |
| Saskatchewan | 0.05 | (0.04) | -1.08 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.04) | 0.29 | (0.05) | 1.21 | (0.05) | 0.91 | (0.02) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | -0.09 | (0.05) | -1.34 | (0.05) | -0.42 | (0.06) | 0.24 | (0.07) | 1.16 | (0.04) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Basilicata | 0.05 | (0.05) | -1.22 | (0.06) | -0.29 | (0.07) | 0.45 | (0.05) | 1.29 | (0.05) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Bolzano | 0.05 | (0.03) | -1.20 | (0.04) | -0.33 | (0.04) | 0.41 | (0.04) | 1.34 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.02) |
| Calabria | 0.04 | (0.05) | -1.22 | (0.07) | -0.30 | (0.05) | 0.39 | (0.08) | 1.28 | (0.05) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Campania | 0.10 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.05) | -0.26 | (0.07) | 0.51 | (0.07) | 1.31 | (0.06) | 0.98 | (0.03) |
| Emilia Romagna | -0.11 | (0.04) | -1.31 | (0.05) | -0.51 | (0.06) | 0.20 | (0.05) | 1.20 | (0.06) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | -0.09 | (0.04) | -1.40 | (0.05) | -0.47 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 1.24 | (0.05) | 1.04 | (0.03) |
| Lazio | -0.07 | (0.04) | -1.32 | (0.04) | -0.40 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 1.18 | (0.05) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Liguria | -0.20 | (0.06) | -1.44 | (0.08) | -0.55 | (0.07) | 0.14 | (0.06) | 1.08 | (0.07) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Lombardia | -0.01 | (0.05) | -1.34 | (0.06) | -0.36 | (0.06) | 0.38 | (0.07) | 1.27 | (0.03) | 1.03 | (0.02) |
| Marche | -0.21 | (0.05) | -1.44 | (0.06) | -0.59 | (0.06) | 0.14 | (0.08) | 1.04 | (0.04) | 0.98 | (0.02) |
| Molise | 0.09 | (0.04) | -1.18 | (0.06) | -0.19 | (0.06) | 0.45 | (0.05) | 1.29 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
| Piemonte | -0.10 | (0.08) | -1.38 | (0.07) | -0.44 | (0.09) | 0.23 | (0.08) | 1.19 | (0.09) | 1.01 | (0.02) |
| Puglia | 0.02 | (0.04) | -1.16 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.04) | 0.35 | (0.06) | 1.21 | (0.04) | 0.94 | (0.02) |
| Sardegna | -0.28 | (0.05) | -1.52 | (0.06) | -0.65 | (0.06) | 0.04 | (0.06) | 1.03 | (0.05) | 1.01 | (0.03) |
| Sicilia | 0.08 | (0.05) | -1.16 | (0.05) | -0.26 | (0.06) | 0.44 | (0.06) | 1.30 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.02) |
| Toscana | -0.22 | (0.05) | -1.39 | (0.06) | -0.55 | (0.05) | 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.99 | (0.06) | 0.94 | (0.02) |
| Trento | 0.02 | (0.05) | -1.28 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.06) | 0.39 | (0.07) | 1.26 | (0.05) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Umbria | -0.12 | (0.05) | -1.36 | (0.06) | -0.45 | (0.06) | 0.24 | (0.05) | 1.10 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.02) |
| Valle d'Aosta | -0.29 | (0.04) | -1.54 | (0.07) | -0.60 | (0.05) | -0.02 | (0.05) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Veneto | -0.12 | (0.08) | -1.39 | (0.10) | -0.45 | (0.09) | 0.21 | (0.07) | 1.14 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 0.00 | (0.06) | -1.11 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.04) | 0.27 | (0.07) | 1.13 | (0.08) | 0.89 | (0.03) |
| Baja California | -0.03 | (0.05) | -1.17 | (0.05) | -0.35 | (0.06) | 0.19 | (0.05) | 1.22 | (0.08) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
| Baja California Sur | -0.13 | (0.05) | -1.29 | (0.07) | -0.45 | (0.06) | 0.17 | (0.04) | 1.05 | (0.05) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Campeche | 0.02 | (0.04) | -1.13 | (0.05) | -0.31 | (0.05) | 0.24 | (0.05) | 1.27 | (0.08) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
| Chiapas | 0.04 | (0.04) | -1.11 | (0.07) | -0.18 | (0.06) | 0.33 | (0.04) | 1.12 | (0.06) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
| Chihuahua | 0.09 | (0.05) | -1.14 | (0.07) | -0.19 | (0.07) | 0.42 | (0.06) | 1.27 | (0.06) | 0.96 | (0.03) |
| Coahuila | 0.02 | (0.05) | -1.10 | (0.08) | -0.26 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.06) | 1.15 | (0.08) | 0.89 | (0.03) |
| Colima | 0.12 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.12) | -0.22 | (0.09) | 0.48 | (0.08) | 1.32 | (0.06) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Distrito Federal | 0.00 | (0.04) | -1.16 | (0.05) | -0.33 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.06) | 1.22 | (0.06) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
| Durango | 0.12 | (0.06) | -1.06 | (0.08) | -0.18 | (0.07) | 0.42 | (0.07) | 1.31 | (0.07) | 0.94 | (0.04) |
| Guanajuato | 0.04 | (0.06) | -1.13 | (0.08) | -0.27 | (0.05) | 0.30 | (0.08) | 1.26 | (0.10) | 0.93 | (0.04) |
| Guerrero | -0.06 | (0.05) | -1.15 | (0.06) | -0.31 | (0.05) | 0.20 | (0.05) | 1.04 | (0.07) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
| Hidalgo | 0.16 | (0.06) | -0.97 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.06) | 0.45 | (0.07) | 1.29 | (0.08) | 0.90 | (0.03) |
| Jalisco | 0.02 | (0.04) | -1.15 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.04) | 0.31 | (0.07) | 1.19 | (0.07) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Mexico | 0.03 | (0.05) | -1.01 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.05) | 0.27 | (0.06) | 1.12 | (0.07) | 0.85 | (0.03) |
| Morelos | -0.04 | (0.06) | -1.17 | (0.08) | -0.31 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.07) | 1.11 | (0.07) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| Nayarit | 0.04 | (0.08) | -1.15 | (0.08) | -0.34 | (0.07) | 0.37 | (0.10) | 1.31 | (0.08) | 0.98 | (0.03) |
| Nuevo León | 0.16 | (0.06) | -1.09 | (0.04) | -0.15 | (0.07) | 0.46 | (0.08) | 1.43 | (0.09) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Puebla | 0.14 | (0.05) | -0.91 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.05) | 0.40 | (0.05) | 1.17 | (0.05) | 0.83 | (0.03) |
| Querétaro | 0.20 | (0.08) | -1.03 | (0.08) | -0.07 | (0.09) | 0.50 | (0.07) | 1.40 | (0.09) | 0.96 | (0.03) |
| Quintana Roo | 0.04 | (0.06) | -1.07 | (0.07) | -0.30 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.25 | (0.08) | 0.91 | (0.03) |
| San Luis Potosí | 0.10 | (0.05) | -1.09 | (0.06) | -0.19 | (0.06) | 0.42 | (0.05) | 1.28 | (0.06) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
| Sinaloa | -0.12 | (0.07) | -1.27 | (0.07) | -0.44 | (0.08) | 0.16 | (0.07) | 1.10 | (0.10) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
| Tabasco | -0.12 | (0.05) | -1.26 | (0.08) | -0.45 | (0.07) | 0.16 | (0.06) | 1.07 | (0.07) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Tamaulipas | 0.08 | (0.06) | -1.08 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.08) | 0.39 | (0.09) | 1.24 | (0.06) | 0.92 | (0.02) |
| Tlaxcala | 0.14 | (0.05) | -1.04 | (0.07) | -0.16 | (0.07) | 0.47 | (0.07) | 1.28 | (0.05) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Veracruz | 0.22 | (0.05) | -0.85 | (0.05) | -0.07 | (0.06) | 0.49 | (0.06) | 1.32 | (0.08) | 0.86 | (0.03) |
| Yucatán | 0.01 | (0.06) | -1.16 | (0.10) | -0.26 | (0.04) | 0.27 | (0.07) | 1.21 | (0.07) | 0.94 | (0.03) |
| Zacatecas | -0.01 | (0.05) | -1.16 | (0.07) | -0.30 | (0.04) | 0.27 | (0.06) | 1.16 | (0.08) | 0.91 | (0.03) |

[^50]Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.5.6 for national data.
StatLink (nilा
[Part 2/4]
Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance, by region
Table B2.IV. 24 Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Index of disciplinary climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variability in this index |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All students |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Mean index | S.E. | Standard deviation | S.E. |
| Q Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Alentejo | 0.06 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.09) | -0.26 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.11) | 1.26 | (0.09) | 0.93 | (0.04) |
| - Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andalusia* | 0.03 | (0.07) | -1.41 | (0.08) | -0.31 | (0.07) | 0.47 | (0.08) | 1.39 | (0.08) | 1.10 | (0.03) |
| Aragon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.03 | (0.06) | -1.23 | (0.07) | -0.36 | (0.07) | 0.24 | (0.08) | 1.25 | (0.07) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
| Asturias ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.01 | (0.05) | -1.23 | (0.05) | -0.37 | (0.05) | 0.35 | (0.08) | 1.28 | (0.06) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Balearic Islands* | -0.06 | (0.05) | -1.47 | (0.08) | -0.42 | (0.05) | 0.32 | (0.07) | 1.32 | (0.05) | 1.09 | (0.03) |
| Basque Country* | -0.15 | (0.03) | -1.24 | (0.03) | -0.45 | (0.03) | 0.08 | (0.03) | 1.01 | (0.04) | 0.90 | (0.01) |
| Cantabria ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 0.09 | (0.05) | -1.25 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.08) | 0.48 | (0.05) | 1.38 | (0.05) | 1.03 | (0.03) |
| Castile and Leon ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.00 | (0.05) | -1.28 | (0.07) | -0.35 | (0.05) | 0.36 | (0.07) | 1.27 | (0.05) | 1.01 | (0.03) |
| Catalonia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.16 | (0.08) | -1.43 | (0.09) | -0.50 | (0.09) | 0.18 | (0.08) | 1.11 | (0.08) | 1.00 | (0.03) |
| Extremadura* | 0.02 | (0.05) | -1.27 | (0.06) | -0.32 | (0.05) | 0.34 | (0.08) | 1.31 | (0.05) | 1.01 | (0.03) |
| Galicia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.05 | (0.06) | -1.41 | (0.07) | -0.36 | (0.06) | 0.28 | (0.08) | 1.29 | (0.05) | 1.05 | (0.03) |
| La Rioja ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.04 | (0.03) | -1.26 | (0.05) | -0.29 | (0.04) | 0.39 | (0.05) | 1.30 | (0.04) | 1.01 | (0.02) |
| Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 0.03 | (0.06) | -1.18 | (0.06) | -0.29 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.09) | 1.28 | (0.07) | 0.97 | (0.02) |
| Murcia ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | -0.07 | (0.05) | -1.35 | (0.06) | -0.39 | (0.05) | 0.28 | (0.05) | 1.18 | (0.05) | 0.99 | (0.02) |
| Navarre ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.03 | (0.05) | -1.24 | (0.05) | -0.34 | (0.05) | 0.37 | (0.08) | 1.34 | (0.05) | 1.02 | (0.02) |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 0.15 | (0.03) | -1.24 | (0.04) | -0.16 | (0.04) | 0.55 | (0.03) | 1.46 | (0.03) | 1.06 | (0.02) |
| Northern Ireland | 0.21 | (0.05) | -1.20 | (0.06) | -0.09 | (0.06) | 0.62 | (0.05) | 1.51 | (0.05) | 1.06 | (0.02) |
| Scotland ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.10 | (0.04) | -1.33 | (0.05) | -0.20 | (0.05) | 0.51 | (0.04) | 1.40 | (0.04) | 1.07 | (0.02) |
| Wales | 0.11 | (0.03) | -1.27 | (0.05) | -0.23 | (0.04) | 0.48 | (0.03) | 1.44 | (0.04) | 1.06 | (0.02) |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut* | 0.30 | (0.05) | -0.98 | (0.08) | -0.02 | (0.04) | 0.67 | (0.08) | 1.55 | (0.03) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Florida ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | -0.01 | (0.05) | -1.31 | (0.06) | -0.33 | (0.05) | 0.26 | (0.07) | 1.32 | (0.05) | 1.03 | (0.02) |
| Massachusetts ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0.32 | (0.05) | -1.04 | (0.09) | 0.01 | (0.06) | 0.73 | (0.06) | 1.58 | (0.03) | 1.04 | (0.03) |
| \% Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | -0.45 | (0.04) | -1.56 | (0.06) | -0.76 | (0.04) | -0.17 | (0.05) | 0.69 | (0.07) | 0.90 | (0.03) |
| - Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acre | -0.32 | (0.07) | -1.39 | (0.09) | -0.68 | (0.06) | -0.13 | (0.07) | 0.93 | (0.10) | 0.93 | (0.03) |
| Alagoas | -0.45 | (0.06) | -1.54 | (0.08) | -0.82 | (0.06) | -0.24 | (0.08) | 0.79 | (0.08) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Amapá | -0.31 | (0.05) | -1.30 | (0.06) | -0.59 | (0.07) | -0.06 | (0.05) | 0.74 | (0.08) | 0.81 | (0.04) |
| Amazonas | -0.49 | (0.06) | -1.59 | (0.08) | -0.81 | (0.05) | -0.24 | (0.06) | 0.68 | (0.11) | 0.91 | (0.04) |
| Bahia | -0.37 | (0.13) | -1.38 | (0.16) | -0.59 | (0.10) | -0.16 | (0.13) | 0.65 | (0.17) | 0.82 | (0.04) |
| Ceará | -0.25 | (0.06) | -1.50 | (0.09) | -0.62 | (0.07) | 0.01 | (0.08) | 1.12 | (0.06) | 1.02 | (0.03) |
| Espírito Santo | -0.44 | (0.07) | -1.62 | (0.10) | -0.74 | (0.08) | -0.15 | (0.08) | 0.77 | (0.06) | 0.95 | (0.03) |
| Federal District | -0.19 | (0.10) | -1.29 | (0.10) | -0.53 | (0.09) | 0.08 | (0.10) | 1.00 | (0.14) | 0.91 | (0.05) |
| Goiás | -0.45 | (0.07) | -1.54 | (0.08) | -0.69 | (0.05) | -0.22 | (0.07) | 0.66 | (0.11) | 0.87 | (0.04) |
| Maranhão | -0.31 | (0.06) | -1.28 | (0.08) | -0.63 | (0.07) | -0.11 | (0.06) | 0.77 | (0.08) | 0.83 | (0.04) |
| Mato Grosso | -0.47 | (0.06) | -1.61 | (0.09) | -0.77 | (0.06) | -0.23 | (0.05) | 0.73 | (0.10) | 0.94 | (0.05) |
| Mato Grosso do Sul | -0.20 | (0.06) | -1.40 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.07) | 0.11 | (0.07) | 1.06 | (0.07) | 0.97 | (0.03) |
| Minas Gerais | -0.27 | (0.06) | -1.41 | (0.09) | -0.55 | (0.06) | 0.00 | (0.07) | 0.91 | (0.09) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Pará | -0.34 | (0.15) | -1.40 | (0.10) | -0.70 | (0.09) | -0.13 | (0.14) | 0.90 | (0.29) | 0.92 | (0.08) |
| Paraíba | -0.25 | (0.06) | -1.33 | (0.07) | -0.56 | (0.07) | 0.05 | (0.08) | 0.88 | (0.07) | 0.88 | (0.03) |
| Paraná | -0.49 | (0.05) | -1.56 | (0.06) | -0.82 | (0.06) | -0.28 | (0.05) | 0.71 | (0.10) | 0.92 | (0.04) |
| Pernambuco | -0.30 | (0.09) | -1.46 | (0.08) | -0.66 | (0.10) | -0.09 | (0.12) | 1.04 | (0.11) | 0.99 | (0.03) |
| Piauí | -0.23 | (0.05) | -1.24 | (0.08) | -0.56 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.05) | 0.92 | (0.13) | 0.87 | (0.06) |
| Rio de Janeiro | -0.37 | (0.08) | -1.58 | (0.09) | -0.67 | (0.08) | -0.07 | (0.10) | 0.85 | (0.10) | 0.96 | (0.04) |
| Rio Grande do Norte | -0.22 | (0.11) | -1.39 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.08) | -0.05 | (0.14) | 1.18 | (0.20) | 1.02 | (0.06) |
| Rio Grande do Sul | -0.35 | (0.05) | -1.41 | (0.08) | -0.62 | (0.06) | -0.11 | (0.05) | 0.74 | (0.05) | 0.86 | (0.03) |
| Rondônia | -0.32 | (0.06) | -1.43 | (0.06) | -0.65 | (0.05) | -0.09 | (0.07) | 0.89 | (0.11) | 0.92 | (0.03) |
| Roraima | -0.44 | (0.08) | -1.50 | (0.12) | -0.73 | (0.07) | -0.23 | (0.08) | 0.72 | (0.12) | 0.89 | (0.06) |
| Santa Catarina | -0.22 | (0.08) | -1.28 | (0.07) | -0.48 | (0.09) | 0.03 | (0.07) | 0.87 | (0.15) | 0.86 | (0.05) |
| São Paulo | -0.36 | (0.04) | -1.55 | (0.04) | -0.69 | (0.05) | -0.10 | (0.04) | 0.91 | (0.09) | 0.98 | (0.03) |
| Sergipe | -0.40 | (0.08) | -1.43 | (0.11) | -0.69 | (0.09) | -0.11 | (0.09) | 0.66 | (0.09) | 0.85 | (0.05) |
| Tocantins | -0.47 | (0.07) | -1.53 | (0.08) | -0.76 | (0.08) | -0.25 | (0.08) | 0.66 | (0.08) | 0.87 | (0.03) |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogota | -0.05 | (0.04) | -1.10 | (0.05) | -0.28 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.05) | 0.97 | (0.06) | 0.83 | (0.02) |
| Cali | 0.06 | (0.06) | -0.96 | (0.06) | -0.23 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.07) | 1.10 | (0.09) | 0.82 | (0.02) |
| Manizales | 0.01 | (0.05) | -0.98 | (0.07) | -0.26 | (0.04) | 0.21 | (0.05) | 1.06 | (0.08) | 0.81 | (0.02) |
| Medellin | -0.10 | (0.07) | -1.15 | (0.07) | -0.38 | (0.07) | 0.13 | (0.06) | 1.02 | (0.08) | 0.86 | (0.02) |
| Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perm Territory region* | 0.23 | (0.05) | -1.11 | (0.06) | -0.09 | (0.05) | 0.59 | (0.06) | 1.53 | (0.06) | 1.03 | (0.02) |
| United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abu Dhabi* | -0.07 | (0.04) | -1.43 | (0.04) | -0.47 | (0.05) | 0.29 | (0.06) | 1.33 | (0.04) | 1.09 | (0.01) |
| Ajman | -0.07 | (0.06) | -1.20 | (0.09) | -0.46 | (0.08) | 0.19 | (0.05) | 1.21 | (0.09) | 0.95 | (0.04) |
| Dubai• | 0.09 | (0.02) | -1.18 | (0.03) | -0.27 | (0.02) | 0.44 | (0.03) | 1.36 | (0.03) | 1.00 | (0.01) |
| Fujairah | 0.02 | (0.09) | -1.30 | (0.12) | -0.40 | (0.08) | 0.32 | (0.12) | 1.47 | (0.11) | 1.08 | (0.05) |
| Ras Al Khaimah | -0.09 | (0.07) | -1.37 | (0.08) | -0.53 | (0.08) | 0.23 | (0.09) | 1.32 | (0.08) | 1.05 | (0.03) |
| Sharjah | 0.19 | (0.08) | -1.09 | (0.09) | -0.16 | (0.11) | 0.52 | (0.13) | 1.49 | (0.08) | 0.99 | (0.04) |
| Umm Al Quwain | -0.14 | (0.07) | -1.28 | (0.07) | -0.55 | (0.09) | 0.15 | (0.10) | 1.18 | (0.11) | 0.98 | (0.04) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.5.6 for national data.
StatLink 司|st http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
[Part 3/4]
Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance, by region

|  | School variability in the distribution of this index | Performance on the mathematics scale, by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained variance in student performance (r-squared x 100) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Top } \\ \text { quarter } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of the index variance between schools | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Score dif. | S.E. | Ratio | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia <br> Australian capital <br> New South Wales <br> Northern territory <br> Queensland <br> South Australia <br> Tasmania <br> Victoria <br> Western Australia | 6.84 | 474 | (10.4) | 512 | (10.6) | 522 | (9.0) | 556 | (10.2) | 30.1 | (4.4) | 2.3 | (0.38) | 11.0 | (3.03) |
|  | 10.25 | 464 | (5.2) | 491 | (5.5) | 522 | (6.5) | 554 | (6.2) | 31.9 | (2.3) | 2.0 | (0.18) | 11.8 | (1.59) |
|  | 3.68 | 429 | (20.5) | 449 | (18.1) | 459 | (22.5) | 496 | (17.8) | 25.9 | (8.9) | 1.4 | (0.30) | 5.6 | (3.49) |
|  | 2.47 | 459 | (5.5) | 493 | (5.4) | 516 | (7.1) | 548 | (5.4) | 30.7 | (2.3) | 2.2 | (0.21) | 12.0 | (1.51) |
|  | 0.46 | 459 | (6.2) | 475 | (7.5) | 497 | (7.6) | 529 | (6.8) | 27.8 | (3.1) | 1.7 | (0.22) | 9.2 | (2.07) |
|  | 6.62 | 457 | (8.0) | 458 | (9.0) | 490 | (10.7) | 523 | (9.0) | 25.7 | (3.7) | 1.4 | (0.21) | 7.0 | (1.93) |
|  | 7.82 | 469 | (5.2) | 490 | (6.2) | 509 | (5.8) | 538 | (7.0) | 27.1 | (2.8) | 1.7 | (0.20) | 8.7 | (1.67) |
|  | 8.69 | 479 | (6.2) | 505 | (6.3) | 532 | (7.7) | 553 | (7.9) | 27.9 | (3.6) | 1.8 | (0.24) | 8.9 | (2.20) |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flemish community* | 6.10 | 517 | (5.4) | 532 | (4.7) | 543 | (4.9) | 556 | (5.3) | 14.5 | (2.7) | 1.4 | (0.11) | 2.1 | (0.71) |
| French community | 7.03 | 464 | (5.0) | 491 | (5.6) | 521 | (6.5) | 554 | (6.2) | 31.9 | (2.3) | 2.0 | (0.16) | 11.8 | (1.59) |
| German-speaking community | 5.86 | 469 | (5.2) | 490 | (5.7) | 510 | (6.0) | 538 | (7.0) | 27.1 | (2.8) | 1.7 | (0.20) | 8.7 | (1.67) |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alberta | 3.57 | 497 | (7.3) | 510 | (7.1) | 536 | (7.8) | 541 | (7.9) | 16.9 | (4.2) | 1.6 | (0.23) | 3.5 | (1.70) |
| British Columbia | 8.87 | 502 | (7.6) | 528 | (6.7) | 530 | (6.0) | 540 | (7.4) | 14.1 | (2.7) | 1.6 | (0.18) | 2.5 | (1.01) |
| Manitoba | 5.42 | 468 | (6.0) | 485 | (5.8) | 504 | (5.9) | 525 | (8.2) | 22.6 | (3.7) | 1.5 | (0.22) | 5.9 | (1.85) |
| New Brunswick | 3.18 | 482 | (6.9) | 498 | (7.5) | 517 | (8.4) | 523 | (7.6) | 17.2 | (3.7) | 1.7 | (0.32) | 4.0 | (1.62) |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 4.88 | 483 | (11.0) | 495 | (8.6) | 506 | (7.4) | 491 | (7.0) | 2.2 | (3.9) | 1.3 | (0.23) | 0.1 | (0.35) |
| Nova Scotia | 7.08 | 461 | (13.2) | 500 | (6.0) | 510 | (8.3) | 533 | (6.2) | 22.4 | (4.4) | 2.3 | (0.63) | 8.8 | (3.15) |
| Ontario | 3.79 | 493 | (5.7) | 508 | (7.5) | 520 | (7.2) | 541 | (5.9) | 18.6 | (2.3) | 1.6 | (0.14) | 4.2 | (0.99) |
| Prince Edward Island | 9.34 | 457 | (6.2) | 481 | (8.0) | 494 | (6.2) | 500 | (5.6) | 17.5 | (2.9) | 1.7 | (0.23) | 4.4 | (1.41) |
| Quebec | 6.56 | 513 | (5.0) | 530 | (5.5) | 551 | (6.2) | 563 | (6.0) | 18.8 | (2.6) | 1.6 | (0.19) | 4.3 | (1.15) |
| Saskatchewan | 5.39 | 493 | (5.1) | 509 | (6.9) | 520 | (7.3) | 518 | (7.2) | 11.1 | (3.0) | 1.3 | (0.17) | 1.6 | (0.88) |
| Italy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abruzzo | 2.54 | 444 | (9.3) | 472 | (7.9) | 485 | (10.7) | 514 | (10.6) | 25.2 | (4.1) | 1.7 | (0.25) | 7.4 | (2.15) |
| Basilicata | 8.57 | 452 | (8.2) | 451 | (7.8) | 472 | (7.0) | 490 | (7.0) | 15.4 | (3.0) | 1.3 | (0.21) | 3.4 | (1.26) |
| Bolzano | 3.55 | 484 | (5.1) | 496 | (5.4) | 516 | (6.2) | 537 | (5.2) | 20.9 | (2.5) | 1.6 | (0.21) | 5.8 | (1.28) |
| Calabria | 6.10 | 402 | (9.0) | 423 | (7.9) | 446 | (10.7) | 458 | (7.4) | 20.5 | (4.0) | 2.0 | (0.31) | 5.4 | (1.96) |
| Campania | 2.54 | 430 | (8.4) | 453 | (11.2) | 462 | (9.5) | 471 | (13.6) | 15.1 | (3.8) | 1.5 | (0.26) | 2.8 | (1.40) |
| Emilia Romagna | 4.75 | 483 | (8.5) | 486 | (11.4) | 509 | (10.6) | 532 | (8.2) | 18.6 | (3.6) | 1.2 | (0.18) | 3.7 | (1.21) |
| Friuli Venezia Giulia | 6.95 | 496 | (6.7) | 512 | (9.2) | 528 | (7.8) | 555 | (8.0) | 20.4 | (2.9) | 1.6 | (0.22) | 5.5 | (1.48) |
| Lazio | 8.22 | 450 | (9.7) | 453 | (9.0) | 490 | (10.4) | 513 | (7.1) | 24.9 | (3.3) | 1.8 | (0.25) | 7.2 | (1.79) |
| Liguria | 6.94 | 472 | (9.3) | 476 | (9.2) | 503 | (8.3) | 506 | (9.7) | 11.8 | (4.9) | 1.4 | (0.22) | 1.7 | (1.35) |
| Lombardia | 3.18 | 483 | (10.6) | 507 | (10.5) | 527 | (11.4) | 553 | (10.4) | 26.6 | (3.8) | 2.1 | (0.42) | 10.2 | (2.66) |
| Marche | 4.43 | 472 | (7.4) | 481 | (8.9) | 508 | (10.0) | 522 | (7.3) | 19.2 | (3.2) | 1.5 | (0.21) | 4.8 | (1.40) |
| Molise | 5.39 | 445 | (7.0) | 462 | (7.2) | 480 | (8.8) | 480 | (7.8) | 14.3 | (3.7) | 1.8 | (0.29) | 2.7 | (1.37) |
| Piemonte | 3.68 | 467 | (9.0) | 495 | (9.3) | 509 | (12.6) | 526 | (8.2) | 20.8 | (2.9) | 1.8 | (0.20) | 5.8 | (1.68) |
| Puglia | 4.81 | 457 | (9.8) | 470 | (8.1) | 491 | (8.5) | 501 | (8.2) | 16.4 | (4.0) | 1.5 | (0.20) | 3.1 | (1.40) |
| Sardegna | 6.80 | 447 | (10.1) | 443 | (12.3) | 460 | (9.2) | 485 | (7.0) | 14.6 | (4.5) | 1.3 | (0.22) | 2.8 | (1.77) |
| Sicilia | 7.82 | 434 | (7.9) | 439 | (7.5) | 458 | (7.6) | 468 | (9.5) | 12.3 | (3.8) | 1.4 | (0.20) | 2.1 | (1.24) |
| Toscana | 10.27 | 479 | (8.3) | 491 | (8.4) | 505 | (7.8) | 531 | (8.5) | 19.2 | (4.8) | 1.4 | (0.25) | 4.1 | (2.01) |
| Trento | 3.55 | 501 | (6.2) | 506 | (7.5) | 545 | (8.5) | 545 | (7.1) | 17.9 | (3.0) | 1.4 | (0.18) | 4.8 | (1.52) |
| Umbria | 5.68 | 474 | (7.0) | 495 | (8.7) | 496 | (11.1) | 513 | (11.2) | 13.4 | (5.1) | 1.4 | (0.25) | 2.2 | (1.74) |
| Valle d'Aosta | 6.97 | 476 | (8.0) | 487 | (7.1) | 488 | (8.7) | 529 | (7.8) | 19.1 | (3.7) | 1.4 | (0.35) | 5.5 | (2.15) |
| Veneto | 8.35 | 500 | (9.4) | 516 | (12.8) | 539 | (12.8) | 547 | (8.5) | 19.3 | (4.9) | 1.5 | (0.23) | 4.4 | (2.05) |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aguascalientes | 5.58 | 428 | (7.2) | 433 | (7.4) | 446 | (9.9) | 453 | (10.6) | 12.1 | (4.0) | 1.1 | (0.20) | 2.1 | (1.37) |
| Baja California | 3.80 | 411 | (9.4) | 412 | (8.5) | 414 | (8.4) | 424 | (7.5) | 5.2 | (4.0) | 1.1 | (0.21) | 0.5 | (0.74) |
| Baja California Sur | 4.88 | 397 | (10.9) | 414 | (7.4) | 413 | (8.6) | 431 | (7.2) | 14.6 | (3.3) | 1.5 | (0.32) | 3.7 | (1.66) |
| Campeche | 9.02 | 379 | (7.1) | 387 | (7.9) | 398 | (7.9) | 418 | (6.9) | 15.1 | (3.2) | 1.5 | (0.27) | 4.1 | (1.72) |
| Chiapas | 6.05 | 346 | (10.9) | 375 | (10.1) | 388 | (8.6) | 388 | (8.9) | 18.5 | (3.6) | 1.9 | (0.33) | 4.8 | (1.92) |
| Chihuahua | 9.11 | 417 | (15.0) | 426 | (12.1) | 432 | (8.1) | 448 | (9.9) | 11.7 | (6.2) | 1.2 | (0.27) | 2.1 | (2.22) |
| Coahuila | 8.33 | 408 | (9.8) | 421 | (12.0) | 411 | (10.4) | 434 | (12.7) | 9.2 | (3.8) | 1.3 | (0.30) | 1.3 | (1.03) |
| Colima | 6.06 | 416 | (15.1) | 422 | (10.1) | 439 | (6.6) | 447 | (6.8) | 11.6 | (7.1) | 1.7 | (0.39) | 2.0 | (2.43) |
| Distrito Federal | 6.49 | 422 | (8.1) | 429 | (8.2) | 431 | (8.1) | 433 | (7.1) | 3.2 | (3.9) | 1.2 | (0.25) | 0.2 | (0.60) |
| Durango | 3.87 | 402 | (10.8) | 423 | (6.8) | 430 | (13.1) | 456 | (7.7) | 19.3 | (3.9) | 2.0 | (0.34) | 6.2 | (2.29) |
| Guanajuato | 8.69 | 397 | (11.1) | 408 | (8.9) | 426 | (8.8) | 422 | (8.1) | 12.2 | (4.7) | 1.6 | (0.31) | 2.3 | (1.68) |
| Guerrero | 6.05 | 351 | (6.9) | 372 | (6.1) | 374 | (8.3) | 380 | (6.1) | 11.8 | (3.9) | 1.7 | (0.33) | 2.4 | (1.48) |
| Hidalgo | 6.22 | 391 | (10.3) | 402 | (7.7) | 407 | (9.9) | 425 | (10.3) | 16.8 | (5.3) | 1.6 | (0.29) | 4.2 | (2.53) |
| Jalisco | 6.73 | 424 | (10.2) | 438 | (14.8) | 435 | (7.2) | 454 | (8.3) | 12.1 | (4.3) | 1.5 | (0.32) | 2.3 | (1.56) |
| Mexico | 4.11 | 401 | (7.9) | 417 | (7.6) | 418 | (7.1) | 429 | (7.3) | 14.3 | (3.4) | 1.4 | (0.24) | 3.5 | (1.65) |
| Morelos | 8.35 | 415 | (18.3) | 425 | (10.1) | 427 | (10.2) | 420 | (5.7) | 4.7 | (6.8) | 1.5 | (0.30) | 0.3 | (1.02) |
| Nayarit | 4.31 | 395 | (10.1) | 408 | (10.2) | 426 | (10.1) | 438 | (7.3) | 14.7 | (3.8) | 1.6 | (0.28) | 3.6 | (1.68) |
| Nuevo León | 7.22 | 413 | (13.8) | 428 | (9.9) | 449 | (9.7) | 460 | (7.9) | 17.3 | (4.6) | 1.8 | (0.34) | 5.3 | (3.01) |
| Puebla | 5.68 | 411 | (9.2) | 412 | (8.7) | 417 | (8.2) | 431 | (7.9) | 8.5 | (5.7) | 1.2 | (0.26) | 1.0 | (1.25) |
| Querétaro | 6.84 | 422 | (10.3) | 434 | (10.1) | 439 | (10.9) | 446 | (8.6) | 7.0 | (3.9) | 1.6 | (0.40) | 0.8 | (0.95) |
| Quintana Roo | 4.75 | 397 | (6.3) | 414 | (8.8) | 420 | (8.5) | 421 | (6.9) | 10.1 | (4.0) | 1.4 | (0.27) | 1.7 | (1.25) |
| San Luis Potosí | 3.42 | 408 | (11.5) | 412 | (11.8) | 416 | (10.6) | 421 | (8.5) | 6.3 | (4.5) | 1.3 | (0.20) | 0.6 | (0.93) |
| Sinaloa | 5.05 | 393 | (6.9) | 409 | (7.5) | 420 | (7.3) | 421 | (6.4) | 11.9 | (2.7) | 1.5 | (0.22) | 2.7 | (1.26) |
| Tabasco | 3.87 | 364 | (8.5) | 365 | (8.3) | 384 | (7.6) | 404 | (6.9) | 18.6 | (3.1) | 1.6 | (0.28) | 5.9 | (1.75) |
| Tamaulipas | 5.42 | 399 | (10.9) | 403 | (8.2) | 423 | (11.9) | 420 | (8.7) | 11.1 | (3.5) | 1.3 | (0.36) | 1.9 | (1.18) |
| Tlaxcala | 4.81 | 397 | (7.0) | 396 | (8.8) | 428 | (9.3) | 426 | (7.6) | 15.8 | (3.4) | 1.6 | (0.23) | 4.1 | (1.79) |
| Veracruz | 10.29 | 400 | (8.0) | 392 | (10.7) | 401 | (7.9) | 419 | (12.8) | 10.2 | (6.0) | 1.2 | (0.24) | 1.4 | (1.70) |
| Yucatán | 2.47 | 399 | (8.6) | 413 | (9.0) | 414 | (7.6) | 420 | (6.2) | 8.0 | (3.7) | 1.3 | (0.24) | 1.0 | (1.04) |
| Zacatecas | 6.22 | 400 | (7.3) | 412 | (8.8) | 423 | (7.5) | 421 | (8.2) | 10.1 | (3.7) | 1.3 | (0.25) | 1.7 | (1.22) |

- PISA adjudicated region.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
See Table IV.5.6 for national data
StatLink 䣓页http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
［Part 4／4］
Index of disciplinary climate and mathematics performance，by region
Table B2．IV． 24 Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | School variability in the distribution of this index | Performance on the mathematics scale， by national quarters of this index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of this index |  | Increased likelihood of students in the bottom quarter of this index scoring in the bottom quarter of the national mathematics performance distribution |  | Explained <br> variance <br> in student <br> performance <br> $(\mathbf{r}$－squared <br> x 100） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Percentage of the index variance between schools | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Ratio | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
| O Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6.53 | 469 | （20．0） | 488 | （13．0） | 491 | （12．3） | 508 | （18．6） | 18.6 | （9．3） | 1.8 | （0．38） | 3.8 | （3．87） |
| －Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Andalusia＊ | 0.18 | 455 | （9．8） | 463 | （6．4） | 481 | （6．4） | 501 | （8．5） | 14.5 | （4．8） | 1.5 | （0．27） | 3.7 | （2．40） |
|  | Aragon ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 7.41 | 483 | （9．2） | 500 | （8．7） | 495 | （9．7） | 504 | （8．0） | 5.5 | （5．0） | 1.3 | （0．26） | 0.3 | （0．64） |
|  | Asturias＊ | 4.20 | 485 | （8．1） | 498 | （9．4） | 511 | （10．5） | 512 | （9．7） | 11.0 | （5．2） | 1.4 | （0．20） | 1.4 | （1．31） |
|  | Balearic Islands＊ | 1.67 | 459 | （7．9） | 465 | （7．6） | 480 | （7．4） | 504 | （7．1） | 15.2 | （3．4） | 1.5 | （0．23） | 3.9 | （1．71） |
|  | Basque Country＊ | 10.29 | 491 | （4．1） | 506 | （4．2） | 508 | （4．8） | 522 | （4．8） | 11.4 | （2．5） | 1.4 | （0．14） | 1.5 | （0．68） |
|  | Cantabria ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 7.38 | 474 | （6．5） | 479 | （8．2） | 501 | （7．0） | 506 | （7．3） | 11.9 | （3．2） | 1.4 | （0．19） | 2.0 | （1．05） |
|  | Castile and Leon＊ | 11.44 | 491 | （8．6） | 502 | （8．1） | 521 | （6．8） | 523 | （6．7） | 11.9 | （3．7） | 1.5 | （0．21） | 2.1 | （1．24） |
|  | Catalonia＊ | 8.13 | 479 | （8．9） | 490 | （10．2） | 498 | （8．3） | 512 | （6．8） | 11.6 | （2．9） | 1.5 | （0．26） | 2.0 | （0．94） |
|  | Extremadura ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 5.58 | 432 | （10．0） | 462 | （7．4） | 480 | （6．1） | 487 | （6．9） | 20.8 | （4．2） | 1.8 | （0．27） | 5.2 | （2．10） |
|  | Galicia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4.80 | 481 | （7．7） | 493 | （7．7） | 488 | （7．9） | 508 | （6．6） | 7.5 | （3．0） | 1.3 | （0．18） | 0.9 | （0．72） |
|  | La Rioja ${ }^{\text {• }}$ | 4.11 | 473 | （7．3） | 496 | （8．3） | 504 | （6．5） | 538 | （7．0） | 22.6 | （3．4） | 1.7 | （0．22） | 5.4 | （1．58） |
|  | Madrid ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 3.57 | 478 | （7．2） | 495 | （9．1） | 510 | （8．1） | 530 | （5．9） | 19.1 | （3．2） | 1.7 | （0．28） | 4.6 | （1．53） |
|  | Murcia ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 7.38 | 451 | （7．5） | 453 | （8．4） | 458 | （9．4） | 485 | （6．4） | 11.8 | （3．6） | 1.2 | （0．18） | 1.8 | （1．10） |
|  | Navarre＊ | 5.86 | 493 | （5．4） | 508 | （6．0） | 523 | （6．8） | 540 | （7．0） | 19.1 | （3．3） | 1.4 | （0．17） | 5.4 | （1．85） |
| United Kingdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | England | 6.62 | 467 | （5．1） | 487 | （5．0） | 515 | （5．6） | 527 | （6．2） | 22.8 | （2．3） | 1.8 | （0．16） | 6.6 | （1．27） |
|  | Northern Ireland | 4.20 | 451 | （7．1） | 471 | （5．9） | 509 | （6．3） | 524 | （5．1） | 28.5 | （2．9） | 2.0 | （0．22） | 10.6 | （2．01） |
|  | Scotland＊ | 4.43 | 463 | （5．1） | 491 | （5．9） | 515 | （4．6） | 533 | （4．6） | 25.0 | （2．1） | 2.0 | （0．21） | 10.0 | （1．59） |
|  | Wales | 1.61 | 440 | （4．1） | 463 | （4．7） | 479 | （4．2） | 500 | （3．8） | 20.4 | （2．0） | 1.9 | （0．15） | 6.7 | （1．26） |
| United States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Connecticut ${ }^{\text {＊}}$ | 6.84 | 466 | （8．8） | 482 | （8．3） | 524 | （9．9） | 542 | （7．7） | 31.4 | （3．5） | 1.9 | （0．22） | 10.5 | （1．82） |
|  | Florida ${ }^{\text {－}}$ | 7.37 | 431 | （6．3） | 460 | （8．3） | 476 | （9．6） | 492 | （8．3） | 20.7 | （3．3） | 1.9 | （0．24） | 6.6 | （1．93） |
|  | Massachusetts＊ | 6.80 | 465 | （7．4） | 509 | （10．3） | 540 | （9．5） | 545 | （7．3） | 29.6 | （2．9） | 2.4 | （0．29） | 10.1 | （1．86） |
| 茲 | Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires ${ }^{\bullet}$ | 6.49 | 406 | （12．3） | 415 | （8．6） | 420 | （10．3） | 440 | （10．3） | 12.6 | （6．6） | 1.2 | （0．24） | 1.6 | （1．59） |
|  | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acre | 3.79 | 360 | （8．9） | 360 | （9．7） | 352 | （9．2） | 379 | （9．4） | 7.1 | （4．7） | 1.2 | （0．20） | 1.1 | （1．40） |
|  | Alagoas | 4.31 | 331 | （9．6） | 330 | （10．7） | 347 | （9．7） | 365 | （12．9） | 14.6 | （6．1） | 1.4 | （0．35） | 3.7 | （3．02） |
|  | Amapá | 6.94 | 341 | （13．6） | 363 | （11．1） | 380 | （11．6） | 376 | （13．4） | 15.7 | （5．7） | 1.9 | （0．44） | 4.0 | （2．71） |
|  | Amazonas | 3.42 | 347 | （10．7） | 352 | （7．7） | 368 | （6．7） | 367 | （13．3） | 8.6 | （5．3） | 1.5 | （0．31） | 1.5 | （1．57） |
|  | Bahia | 7.37 | 366 | （20．7） | 399 | （21．9） | 373 | （17．0） | 392 | （20．4） | 11.4 | （9．8） | 1.3 | （0．44） | 1.4 | （2．23） |
|  | Ceará | 7.08 | 345 | （11．8） | 374 | （11．1） | 394 | （16．4） | 401 | （13．2） | 19.0 | （5．6） | 2.0 | （0．49） | 6.0 | （2．88） |
|  | Espírito Santo | 6.84 | 387 | （19．5） | 398 | （12．8） | 437 | （20．5） | 433 | （16．4） | 19.8 | （10．9） | 1.7 | （0．56） | 4.9 | （5．14） |
|  | Federal District | 2.54 | 404 | （20．2） | 404 | （13．6） | 432 | （16．8） | 428 | （11．7） | 12.6 | （8．3） | 1.7 | （0．50） | 1.9 | （3．19） |
|  | Goiás | 4.70 | 367 | （11．0） | 374 | （9．6） | 390 | （11．1） | 395 | （11．5） | 13.4 | （3．7） | 1.3 | （0．39） | 2.7 | （1．64） |
|  | Maranhão | 7.77 | 335 | （15．5） | 336 | （17．5） | 341 | （16．6） | 368 | （13．3） | 12.2 | （4．8） | 1.2 | （0．28） | 1.7 | （1．35） |
|  | Mato Grosso | 10.25 | 353 | （12．7） | 381 | （17．0） | 375 | （9．1） | 391 | （16．3） | 13.5 | （5．4） | 1.9 | （0．37） | 3.2 | （2．16） |
|  | Mato Grosso do Sul | 8.33 | 386 | （9．5） | 392 | （11．4） | 425 | （11．6） | 434 | （12．1） | 18.9 | （4．6） | 1.5 | （0．27） | 6.0 | （2．41） |
|  | Minas Gerais | 4.80 | 395 | （11．2） | 402 | （8．5） | 409 | （9．0） | 410 | （8．8） | 5.8 | （5．0） | 1.2 | （0．20） | 0.6 | （0．97） |
|  | Pará | 1.61 | 352 | （13．4） | 365 | （9．3） | 360 | （10．0） | 378 | （20．8） | 9.5 | （11．9） | 1.4 | （0．29） | 1.9 | （4．96） |
|  | Paraíba | 7.41 | 385 | （21．0） | 412 | （13．1） | 408 | （12．2） | 396 | （8．4） | 6.4 | （6．4） | 1.7 | （0．40） | 0.5 | （0．98） |
|  | Paraná | 8.13 | 392 | （11．7） | 406 | （16．8） | 398 | （12．8） | 410 | （14．4） | 4.1 | （4．2） | 1.2 | （0．23） | 0.2 | （0．42） |
|  | Pernambuco | 1.98 | 354 | （14．2） | 361 | （10．5） | 366 | （12．0） | 384 | （13．1） | 13.0 | （3．4） | 1.4 | （0．43） | 3.5 | （1．86） |
|  | Piauí | 8.22 | 369 | （11．6） | 375 | （10．0） | 396 | （17．2） | 399 | （11．4） | 15.4 | （6．3） | 1.5 | （0．36） | 2.8 | （2．04） |
|  | Rio de Janeiro | 6.73 | 386 | （12．4） | 394 | （10．4） | 396 | （9．8） | 380 | （7．8） | －1．3 | （4．1） | 1.2 | （0．30） | 0.1 | （0．35） |
|  | Rio Grande do Norte | 7.03 | 367 | （9．1） | 369 | （9．5） | 379 | （12．7） | 413 | （30．0） | 17.2 | （10．0） | 1.3 | （0．40） | 4.6 | （4．79） |
|  | Rio Grande do Sul | 11.44 | 396 | （13．4） | 409 | （8．6） | 409 | （11．7） | 414 | （7．5） | 7.6 | （6．8） | 1.4 | （0．37） | 1.0 | （1．65） |
|  | Rondônia | 6.06 | 369 | （8．4） | 379 | （9．4） | 393 | （11．8） | 402 | （8．3） | 12.9 | （3．7） | 1.6 | （0．33） | 3.5 | （1．88） |
|  | Roraima | 0.18 | 343 | （8．0） | 350 | （7．4） | 368 | （12．4） | 395 | （11．8） | 19.9 | （5．0） | 1.4 | （0．30） | 6.4 | （3．08） |
|  | Santa Catarina | 5.05 | 389 | （12．6） | 428 | （17．6） | 420 | （14．4） | 440 | （12．1） | 19.1 | （4．0） | 2.2 | （0．56） | 4.6 | （2．10） |
|  | São Paulo | 6.56 | 380 | （5．8） | 402 | （8．1） | 410 | （8．0） | 422 | （7．4） | 15.7 | （3．3） | 1.7 | （0．23） | 3.8 | （1．63） |
|  | Sergipe | 4.70 | 374 | （11．2） | 364 | （11．4） | 387 | （13．9） | 407 | （14．7） | 19.6 | （6．1） | 1.5 | （0．38） | 5.7 | （2．71） |
|  | Tocantins | 2.54 | 350 | （8．6） | 355 | （10．5） | 373 | （11．5） | 394 | （14．3） | 17.3 | （3．9） | 1.6 | （0．39） | 3.8 | （1．60） |
|  | Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bogota | 6.53 | 382 | （6．8） | 396 | （6．0） | 395 | （5．2） | 404 | （5．5） | 8.8 | （3．5） | 1.5 | （0．27） | 1.3 | （1．10） |
|  | Cali | 7.22 | 372 | （8．2） | 380 | （7．6） | 386 | （9．4） | 400 | （7．4） | 14.6 | （3．9） | 1.5 | （0．25） | 3.1 | （1．71） |
|  | Manizales | 9.11 | 399 | （6．7） | 401 | （9．1） | 407 | （9．6） | 420 | （8．9） | 10.1 | （4．9） | 1.2 | （0．29） | 1.4 | （1．24） |
|  | Medellin | 6.95 | 374 | （7．7） | 386 | （8．0） | 400 | （11．0） | 428 | （14．6） | 22.2 | （6．4） | 1.6 | （0．28） | 5.3 | （2．64） |
|  | Russian Federation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perm Territory region＊ | 1.98 | 456 | （8．6） | 480 | （8．9） | 496 | （7．3） | 507 | （7．1） | 20.0 | （2．5） | 1.7 | （0．22） | 5.2 | （1．32） |
|  | United Arab Emirates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abu Dhabi＊ | 10.27 | 392 | （4．9） | 413 | （6．5） | 441 | （5．4） | 448 | （7．3） | 20.2 | （2．7） | 1.7 | （0．17） | 6.5 | （1．54） |
|  | Ajman | 7.77 | 390 | （13．1） | 403 | （11．3） | 417 | （10．0） | 406 | （8．9） | 6.0 | （3．6） | 1.3 | （0．31） | 0.6 | （0．75） |
|  | Dubai＊ | 3.80 | 434 | （4．1） | 461 | （4．5） | 479 | （4．7） | 489 | （3．9） | 19.9 | （2．1） | 1.8 | （0．16） | 4.6 | （0．94） |
|  | Fujairah | 8.87 | 386 | （17．9） | 410 | （10．7） | 423 | （12．0） | 428 | （11．6） | 16.5 | （4．5） | 2.1 | （0．59） | 4.9 | （2．80） |
|  | Ras Al Khaimah | 6.97 | 386 | （10．1） | 397 | （13．5） | 428 | （10．6） | 449 | （12．8） | 22.9 | （5．1） | 1.7 | （0．44） | 10.1 | （4．06） |
|  | Sharjah | 1.67 | 414 | （13．2） | 445 | （10．5） | 450 | （15．9） | 450 | （15．5） | 13.9 | （7．3） | 1.6 | （0．39） | 2.9 | （3．20） |
|  | Umm Al Quwain | 9.34 | 369 | （10．5） | 391 | （12．3） | 410 | （13．7） | 430 | （12．8） | 22.4 | （5．4） | 1.7 | （0．56） | 8.5 | （3．57） |

－PISA adjudicated region．
Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
see Table IV．5．6 for national data．
StatLink 侢列 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957536

## ANNEX B3

## LIST OF TABLES AVAILABLE ON LINE

The following tables are available in electronic form only.

| http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957384 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEB | Table IV.1.7a | Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by selecting and grouping students |
| WEB | Table IV.1.7b | Relationship between selecting and grouping students and mathematics performance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.7c | Relationship among selecting and grouping students, mathematics performance, and student and school characteristics |
| WEB | Table IV.1.8a | Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by resources invested in education |
| WEB | Table IV.1.8b | Relationship between resources invested in education and mathematics performance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.8c | Relationship among resources invested in education, mathematics performance, and student and school characteristics |
| WEB | Table IV.1.9a | Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by school governance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.9b | Relationship between school governance and mathematics performance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.9c | Relationship among school governance, mathematics performance, and student and school characteristics |
| WEB | Table IV.1.10a | Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by assessment and accountability policies |
| WEB | Table IV.1.10b | Relationship between assessment and accountability policies and mathematics performance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.10c R | Relationship among assessment and accountability policies, mathematics performance, and student and school characteristics |
| WEB | Table IV.1.11a | Variation in mathematics performance and variation explained by the learning environment |
| WEB | Table IV.1.11b R | Relationship between the learning environment and mathematics performance |
| WEB | Table IV.1.11c | Relationship among the learning environment, mathematics performance, and student and school characteristics |
| WEB | Table IV.1.19 | Correlations among selected system-level characteristics, OECD countries |
| WEB | Table IV.1.20 | Correlations among selected system-level characteristics, all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2012 |
| WEB | Table IV.1.30 | Change between 2003 and 2012 in mathematics performance and monitoring mathematics teachers' practice |
| WEB | Table IV.1.31 | Mathematics performance and school admittance policies |

Chapter 2 Selecting and grouping students
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957441
WEB Table IV.2.12 Correlation between stratification indicators
WEB Table IV.2.13 Correlation between stratification and variation in socio-economic status and mathematics performance
WEB Table IV.2.15 Correlation between stratification and students' motivation, after accounting for mathematics performance
Chapter 3 Resources invested in education [Part 1/2]
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957460
WEB Table IV.3.7 Socio-economically advantaged, average and disadvantaged schools
WEB Table IV.3.23 Class size of language-of-instruction lessons
WEB Table IV.3.24 Class size of language-of-instruction lessons, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.26 Percentage of students not attending after-school lessons, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.28 Hours of after-school study time per week, by school features

## Chapter 3 Resources invested in education [Part 2/2]

http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957479
WEB Table IV.3.36 Change between 2003 and 2012 in student-teacher ratio, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.38(1) Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher shortage, by school features ( $1 / 2$ )
WEB Table IV.3.38(2) Change between 2003 and 2012 in teacher shortage, by school features (2/2)
WEB Table IV.3.39 Change between 2003 and 2012 in index of teacher shortage, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.41 (1) Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of physical infrastructure, by school features (1/2)
WEB Table IV. $3.41_{\text {(2) }}$ Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of physical infrastructure, by school features (2/2)
WEB Table IV.3.42 Change between 2003 and 2012 in index of quality of physical infrastructure, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.44(1) Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources, by school features (1/3)
WEB Table IV.3.44(2) Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources, by school features (2/3)
WEB Table IV.3.44(3) Change between 2003 and 2012 in the quality of schools' educational resources, by school features (3/3)
WEB Table IV.3.45 Change between 2003 and 2012 in index of quality of schools' educational resources, by school features
WEB Table IV.3.47 (1) Change between 2003 and 2012 in students' learning time in school, by school features ( $1 / 2$ )
WEB Table IV. 3.47 (2) Change between 2003 and 2012 in students' learning time in school, by school features (2/2)
WEB Tab
Table IV.3.49 Change between 2003 and 2012 in hours of after-school study time per week, by school features

Chapter 4 School governance, assessments and accountability
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498
WEB Table IV.4.13 Index of school management: Framing and communicating the school's goals and curricular development and mathematics performance
WEB Table IV.4.14 Index of school management: Instructional leadership and mathematics performance
WEB Table IV.4.15 Index of school management: Promoting instructional improvements and professional development and mathematics performance
WEB Table IV.4.28 Other factors, criteria or special circumstances used by tertiary institutions to determine admission
WEB Table IV.4.29 Alternative routes that can be used to gain access to the first stage of tertiary education
Annex B2 Results for regions within countries
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536
WEB Table B2.IV. 13 Index of extracurricular mathematics activities at school and mathematics performance, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 15 Index of school responsibility for resource allocation and mathematics performance, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 19 Parental involvement, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 20 Assessment practices, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 23 Index of teacher-student relations and mathematics performance, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 25 Index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate and mathematics performance, by region
WEB Table B2.IV. 26 Index of student-related factors affecting school climate and mathematics performance, by region

These tables, as well as additional material, may be found at: www.pisa.oecd.org.


Annex C

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PISA A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

PISA is a collaborative effort, bringing together experts from the participating countries, steered jointly by their governments on the basis of shared, policy-driven interests.

A PISA Governing Board, on which each country is represented, determines the policy priorities for PISA, in the context of OECD objectives, and oversees adherence to these priorities during the implementation of the programme. This includes setting priorities for the development of indicators, for establishing the assessment instruments, and for reporting the results.

Experts from participating countries also serve on working groups that are charged with linking policy objectives with the best internationally available technical expertise. By participating in these expert groups, countries ensure that the instruments are internationally valid and take into account the cultural and educational contexts in OECD member and partner countries and economies, that the assessment materials have strong measurement properties, and that the instruments place emphasise authenticity and educational validity.

Through National Project Managers, participating countries and economies implement PISA at the national level subject to the agreed administration procedures. National Project Managers play a vital role in ensuring that the implementation of the survey is of high quality, and verify and evaluate the survey results, analyses, reports and publications.
The design and implementation of the surveys, within the framework established by the PISA Governing Board, is the responsibility of external contractors. For PISA 2012, the development and implementation of the cognitive assessment and questionnaires, and of the international options, was carried out by a consortium led by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). Other partners in this Consortium include cApStAn Linguistic Quality Control in Belgium, the Centre de Recherche Public Henri Tudor (CRP-HT) in Luxembourg, the Department of Teacher Education and School Research (ILS) at the University of Oslo in Norway, the Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF) in Germany, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in the United States, the Leibniz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education (IPN) in Germany, the National Institute for Educational Policy Research in Japan (NIER), the Unité d'analyse des systèmes et des pratiques d'enseignement (aSPe) at the University of Liège in Belgium, and WESTAT in the United States, as well as individual consultants from several countries. ACER also collaborated with Achieve, Inc. in the United States to develop the mathematics framework for PISA 2012.

The OECD Secretariat has overall managerial responsibility for the programme, monitors its implementation daily, acts as the secretariat for the PISA Governing Board, builds consensus among countries and serves as the interlocutor between the PISA Governing Board and the international Consortium charged with implementing the activities. The OECD Secretariat also produces the indicators and analyses and prepares the international reports and publications in co-operation with the PISA Consortium and in close consultation with member and partner countries and economies both at the policy level (PISA Governing Board) and at the level of implementation (National Project Managers).

## PISA Governing Board

Chair of the PISA Governing Board: Lorna Bertrand
OECD countries
Australia: Tony Zanderigo
Austria: Mark Német
Belgium: Christiane Blondin and Isabelle Erauw
Canada: Pierre Brochu, Patrick Bussiere and Tomasz Gluszynski
Chile: Leonor Cariola Huerta
Czech Republic: Jana Paleckova
Denmark: Tine Bak and Elsebeth Aller
Estonia: Maie Kitsing
Finland: Tommi Karjalainen
France: Bruno Trosseille
Germany: Elfriede Ohrnberger and Susanne von Below
Greece: Vassilia Hatzinikita and Chryssa Sofianopoulou
Hungary: Benõ Csapó
Iceland: Júlíus Björnsson
Ireland: Jude Cosgrove and Gerry Shiel
Israel: Michal Beller and Hagit Glickman
Italy: Paolo Sestito
Japan: Ryo Watanabe
Korea: Sungsook Kim and Keunwoo Lee
Luxembourg: Amina Kafai

Mexico: Francisco Ciscomani and Eduardo Backhoff Escudero
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## PISA 2012 Results: <br> What Makes Schools Successful? <br> RESOURCES, POLICIES AND PRACTICES VOLUMEIV

The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) examines not just what students know in mathematics, reading and science, but what they can do with what they know. This is one of six volumes that present the results of the 2012 PISA survey, the fifth round of the triennial assessment.

Volume I, What Students Know and Can Do: Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science, summarises the performance of students in PISA 2012.

Volume II, Excellence through Equity: Giving Every Student the Chance to Succeed, defines and measures equity in education and analyses how equity in education has evolved across countries between PISA 2003 and 2012.
Volume III, Ready to Learn: Students' Engagement, Drive and Self-Beliefs, explores students' engagement with and at school, their drive and motivation to succeed, and the beliefs they hold about themselves as mathematics learners.

Volume IV, What Makes Schools Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices, examines how student performance is associated with various characteristics of individual schools and school systems.

Volume V, Skills for Life: Student Performance in Problem Solving, presents student performance in the PISA 2012 assessment of problem solving, which measures students' capacity to respond to non-routine situations.

Volume VI, Students and Money: Financial Literacy Skills for the 21 st Century, examines students' experience with and knowledge about money.

## Contents of this volume

Chapter 1. How resources, policies and practices are related to education outcomes
Chapter 2. Selecting and grouping students
Chapter 3. Resources invested in education
Chapter 4. School governance, assessments and accountability
Chapter 5. How the quality of the learning environment is shaped
Chapter 6. Policy implications of school management and practices

Consult this publication on line at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201156-en
This work is published on the OECD iLibrary, which gathers all OECD books, periodicals and statistical databases. Visit www.oecd-ilibrary.org and do not hesitate to contact us for more information.
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[^15]:    Note：Statistically significant correlations at the $5 \%$ level（ $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ）are shaded．
    Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the correlation between students who had skipped a day or a class and school disciplinary climate．
    Source：OECD，PISA 2012 Database，Table IV．5．11．
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[^16]:    Notes: This figure shows only statistically significant regression coefficients at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ). Negative statistically significant correlations are shaded in grey; positive statistically significant correlations are shaded in blue.
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[^17]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant at the $10 \%$ level ( $p<0.10$ ) are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level ( $p<0.05$ ) are in bold.

    1. See Box IV.3.1 for the definition of socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.
[^18]:    Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
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[^19]:    1. The first age of selection is 14 in Belgium (French Community) since 2008-09

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

    Sources: a) OECD (2010), PISA 2009 Results: What Makes a School Successful
    b) PISA system-level data collection in 2013.
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[^22]:    A socios that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex AB)
    . A socio-economically disadvantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status (ESCS) is statistically significantly below the mean socio-economic status of the country/economy; an average school is one where there is no difference from the country's/economy's mean; and an advantaged school is one whose students' mean socio-economic status is statistically significantly above the country/economy mean.

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
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    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex
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[^28]:    A sociues that are statistically significant are indicated in beld（see Annex AB）．
    （ESCS）is statistically significantly below the mean socio－economic status of the country／economy；an average school is one where there is no difference from the country＇s／economy＇s mean；and an advantaged school is one whose students＇mean socio－economic status is statistically significantly above the country／economy mean．
    ＊See notes at the beginning of this Annex．
    StatLink 眮页恼 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957460

[^29]:    Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
    StatLink 司ाड्रD http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957479

[^30]:    Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.
    

[^31]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

    StatLink जिiा SL http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957498

[^32]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[^33]:    Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
    ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic，social and cultural status of students．
    Only countries and economies with data from the parent questionnaire are shown
    StatLink 亩宁地 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957498

[^34]:    Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown

    1. Schools which are directly controlled or managed by: i) a public education authority or agency or ii) a government agency directly or a governing body, most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise
    2. Schools which receive $50 \%$ or more of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies
    3. Schools which receive less than $50 \%$ of their core funding (i.e. funding that supports the basic educational services of the institution) from government agencies.
    
[^35]:    Notes：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown．
    StatLink 魝页约 http：／／dx．doi．org／10．1787／888932957498

[^36]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
    StatLink न्त्गा st http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^37]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

    StatLink ( ज्ञाsम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^38]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

[^39]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

    StatLink 侢istla http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^40]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3)
    See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
    StatLink (न्ताsप्य http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^41]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.

    StatLink (2्ञाड्रम http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^42]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    See notes at the beginning of this Annex
    StatLink 케포니 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^43]:    Note. Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    1. Regression: School average disciplinary climate $=$ Intercept + variables listed in this table.

    See notes at the beginning of this Annex
    StatLink (त्ता st http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^44]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    1. Logistic regression: SKIP = Intercept + LATE; where SKIP ( $0=$ did not skip; and $1=$ skipped $)$ and LATE ( $0=$ did not arrive late; and $1=$ arrived late $)$.

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex

    StatLink (ailst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957517

[^45]:    Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

    * See notes at the beginning of this Annex.
    

[^46]:    Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold（see Annex A3）．
    1．Logistic regression：LATE $=$ Intercept + variables listed in this table；where LATE（ $0=$ did not arrive late；and $1=$ arrived late ）
    See notes at the beginning of this Annex

[^47]:    Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    Only countries and economies with comparable data from PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are shown.

[^48]:    - PISA adjudicated region.

    Notes: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).
    See Table IV.3.10 for national data.
    StatLink (ninst http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932957536

[^49]:    - PISA adjudicated region.

[^50]:    - PISA adjudicated region.

