Umræðufundur um PISA 2009

Námsmatsstofnun 31. maí 2011

Almar Miðvík Halldórsson

OECD PISA 2009

Volume 3: What Makes a School Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices

Hvað einkennir skóla með góðan námsárangur?

Niðurstöður PISA 2009

Niðurstöður gefnar út af OECD í sex bindum:

- I. bindi: What Students Know and Can Do: Student Performance in Reading, Mathematics and Science
- II. bindi: Overcoming Social Background: Equity in Learning Opportunities and Outcomes
- III. bindi: Learning to Learn: Student Engagement, Strategies and Practices
- IV. bindi: What Makes a School Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices
- V. bindi: Learning Trends: Changes in Student Performance Since 2000
- VI bindi: Digital Readers: Performance in reading digital texts (*Kemur út í júní 2011*)

- Naturally, GDP per capita influences educational success, but this only explains 6% of the differences in average student performance. The other 94% reflect the potential for public policy to make a difference.
 - While better educational outcomes are a strong predictor of economic growth, wealth and spending on education alone are no guarantee for better educational outcomes.
- Overall, PISA shows that an image of a world divided neatly into rich and well-educated countries and poor and badly-educated countries is out of date.
 - It is a warning to advanced economies that they cannot take for granted that they will forever have "human capital" superior to that in other parts of the world.
 - At a time they will need to work hard to maintain a knowledge and skill base that keeps up with changing demands.

- PISA underlines, in particular, the need for many advanced countries to tackle educational underperformance so that as many members of their future workforces as possible are equipped with at least the baseline competencies that enable them to participate in social and economic development.
- Otherwise, the high social and economic cost of poor educational performance in advanced economies risks becoming a significant drag on economic development.

- The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers and principals, since student learning is ultimately the product of what goes on in classrooms.
- Corporations, professional partnerships and national governments all know that they have to pay attention to
 - how the pool from which they recruit is established;
 - how they recruit;
 - the kind of initial training their recruits receive before they present themselves for employment;
 - how they mentor new recruits and induct them into their service;
 - what kind of continuing training they get;
 - how their compensation is structured;
 - how they reward their best performers;
 - how they improve the performance of those who are struggling; and
 - how they provide opportunities for the best performers to acquire more status and responsibility.



Chapter 1 Some features shared by highperforming school systems

How do resources for education, and education policies and practices relate to reading performance? And what is their relationship with the socio-economic background of countries, schools and students? This chapter presents a summary of selected features shared by "successful" school systems, defined by relatively high-achieving students and greater equity in learning outcomes, because socio-economic background has only a moderate impact on performance.

Figure IV.1.1

How much of the variation in reading performance lies between countries, schools and students



1

Selected characteristics of school systems with reading performance above the OECD average

Four areas

	V High vertical differentiation
	v Low vertical differentiation
1. Nemendaval	H High horizontal differentiation at the system level
og getuskipting	h Medium horizontal differentiation at the system level
(Figure IV.3.2)	h Low horizontal differentiation at the system level
	Hsc High horizontal differentiation at the school level
	hsc Low horizontal differentiation at the school level
	A More school autonomy for curriculum and assessment
2. Rekstur skóla	a Less school autonomy for curriculum and assessment
(Figure IV 3.5)	C More school competition
(Inguite Phono)	c Less school competition
	B Frequent use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes
3. Namsmat og	b Infrequent use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes
abyrgo	D Frequent use of assessment or achievement data for decision making
(Figure IV.3.6)	d Infrequent use of assessment or achievement data for decision making
	E High cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15
4. Fjárhagsleg	e Low cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15
stada skola	S Large class size and high teachers' salaries
(Figure IV.3.7)	s Small class size and/or low teachers' salaries

Vertical differentiation

- Age of entry into the school system
- Grade repetition
- Horizontal differentiation at the system level
 - Programmes of study
 - Age of selection
 - School admission policies
- Horizontal differentiation at the school level
 - Student transferring policies
 - Ability grouping within schools



Selected characteristics of school systems with reading performance above the OECD average

Four areas

	V High vertical differentiation
	Low vertical differentiation
1. Nemendaval	H High horizontal differentiation at the system level
og getuskipting	h Medium horizontal differentiation at the system level
(Figure IV.3.2)	h Low horizontal differentiation at the system level
	Hsc High horizontal differentiation at the school level
	hsc Low horizontal differentiation at the school level
	A More school autonomy for curriculum and assessment
2. Rekstur skóla	a Less school autonomy for curriculum and assessment
(Figure IV.3.5)	C More school competition
(ingare initiality)	c Less school competition
	B Frequent use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes
3. Namsmat og	b Infrequent use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes
abyrgo	D Frequent use of assessment or achievement data for decision making
(Figure IV.3.6)	d Infrequent use of assessment or achievement data for decision making
	E High cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15
4. Fjárhagsleg	e Low cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15
stada skola	S Large class size and high teachers' salaries
(Figure IV.3.7)	s Small class size and/or low teachers' salaries

				-J• ~•••	, in the second s			Ísland: 500 Bondoríkin: 500
		Stre	ngth		Four			
		of relat between socio-e	tionship students' conomic		9	3.	4. Bassauross	Bretland: 494
	Reading performance (score points)	and r perfor (% varianc	eading mance e explained)	Selecting and grouping students (Figure IV.3.2)	2. Governance of schools (Figure IV.3.5)	and accountability policies (Figure IV.3.6)	invested in education (Figure IV.3.7)	Countries with similar system characteristics in the four areas
Hong Kong-China	533		4.5	v + h + hsc	A + C	B + D	e + S	-
Iceland	500		6.2	v + h + hsc	A + c	B + D	E + s	Australia, Canada, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States
Estonia	501	ct ackground nce	7.6	v + h + hsc	A + c	B + D	e + s	New Zealand, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Russian Federation
Finland	536	impa omic b forma	7.8	v + h + hsc	A + c	b + d	E + s	—
Japan	520	/erage econo ng per	8.6	v + h + hsc	A + c	b + D	E + S	_
Canada	524	Below-av of socio- on readii	8.6	v + h + hsc	A + c	B + D	E + s	Australia, Iceland, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States
Norway	503]	8.6	v + h + hsc	A + c	B + d	E + s	_
Korea	539		11.0	v + h + hsc	A + C	B + D	E + S	_

Menntakerfi sem hafa lík einkenni Astralía:

Lesskilningur

524

515

Kanada:





Chapter 2

How resources, policies and practices are related to student performance

By focusing on selected organisational features of schools and school systems, this chapter details how resources, policies and practices relate to student performance, and how far positive relationships at the school level translate into positive relationships at the level of the education system. The chapter also discusses how the environment within schools affects learning outcomes.

■ Figure IV.2.1a ■

How school systems' policies for selecting and grouping students are related to educational outcomes

		Reading	g performano	e		Strei socio-econ (V by t	ngth of relation nomic backgro ariance in readin he socio-econor	nship betwee ound and read ng performance nic background	n students' ling performa explained of students)	nce
Vertical differentiation Vertical differentiation				etween countries accounted for features, at GDP/capita ¹		Percentage of variation between countries in of relationship between students' socio- background and reading performa accounted for by school system feat after taking into account GDP/cap		in the strength economic ance tures, pita ¹	Correlation coefficient	
Percentage of students who repeated one or more grades					-0.39					0.53
Average age of entry into primary school					-0.15					0.12
Horizontal differentiation at the	ne system level									
Number of school types or distinct educational programmes available for 15-year-olds					-0.23					0.30
Each additional year of selection prior to the age of 15					-0.18					0.50
Percentage of students in selective schools	0				-0.06					0.28
Horizontal differentiation at the	ne school level									
Percentage of students in schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement behavioural					-0.61					0.47
problems or special learning needs										
Percentage of students in schools that group students by ability in all subjects					-0.42					0.25
	0 1	10 2	20	30	40 %	0 1	10 2	20 3	30 4	40 %

 \mathbf{n}

1. Nemendaval og getuskipting

Figure IV.2.2

School systems with low transfer rates tend to give more autonomy to schools to determine curricula and assessments



1. Nemendaval og getuskipting

Figure IV.2.3

How school policies for selecting and grouping students are related to reading performance

Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countries)



1. Nemendaval og getuskipting

Between-school variance

Trinidad and Tobago		■ Figure IV/2.3 ■
Luxembourg		= ligue IV.2.5 =
Argentina		How school policies for selecting and grouping students are related to reading performance
Turkey		Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries
Uruguay		(100% is the average total variance in reading performance across QECD countries)
Hungary		(Tob to is the average total variance in reading performance actors of EeD countries)
Italy		Variance in reading performance:
Peru		
Brazil		Solely accounted for by school policies for selecting and grouping students
United States		■ Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background
Macao-China		and by school policies for selecting and grouping students
Bulgaria		Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background
Qatar		Solid accounter of by statement and schools socio economic and demographic background
Portugal		Unaccounted for by any of the above factors
Serbia		
Greece		
Dubai (UAE)		
Montenearo		+
Austria		F
Tunisia		
Czech Republic		
Israel		
Croatia		E
Colombia		
Panama		
Shanghai-China		
OECD average		
United Kingdom		
Switzedand		E Contraction of the second seco
Mexico		F
Ireland		F Contraction of the second seco
Chinese Taipei		F
Slovak Republic		
Spain		
Singapore		
Poland		
Romania		E Contraction of the second seco
Netherlands		F Contraction of the second seco
lordan		
New Zealand		
Kyrgyzstan		
Lithuania		
Germany		
Estonia		
Australia Russian Endersition		
Canada		
Sweden		
Denmark		
Thailand		
Slovenia		
Azerbaijan		
Kazakhstan		<u>+</u>
Finland		<u>+</u>
		⊨
Korea		
Belgium		1 Nomondaval
Japan		I. Nemeridavar
	0 30 40 40 50 50	og getuskipting
-20	0 20 40 60 80 10	

■ Figure IV.2.4a ■

How the governance of school systems is related to educational outcomes

		Reading	g performanc	e		Stre socio-eco (\ by	ength of relation nomic backgro /ariance in readin the socio-econor	onship between ound and read ng performance on nic background	n students' ing performa explained of students)	nce
School autonomy	Perce in <i>r</i> afte	Percentage of variation between countries in <i>reading performance</i> accounted for by school system features, after taking into account GDP/capita ¹			Percentage of of relatio bao acco aft	f variation betw nship between ckground and re ounted for by scl er taking into ac	veen countries i students' socio- eading performa hool system fea count GDP/cap	n the strength economic ance tures, pita ¹	Correlation coefficient	
Average index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment (higher values indicate more autonomy)					0.49					-0.23
Average index of school responsibility for resource allocation (higher values indicate more autonomy)					0.03					0.14
School competition										
Percentage of students in schools that compete with other schools for students in the same area					0.10					0.15
Percentage of students in private schools					0.04	D				0.05
(0 1	10 2	0 3	60 4	0 %	0	10 2	20 3	0 4	40 %

n



Figure IV.2.5

How the governance of schools is related to reading performance

Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countries)

- Variance in reading performance:
- Solely accounted for by schools governance
- Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and by school governance
- Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background
- $\hfill\square$ Unaccounted for by any of the above factors

■ Figure IV.2.6a ■

How school systems' assessment and accountability policies are related to educational outcomes

		Reading	g performance	e		Stree socio-ecor (V by t	ngth of relation nomic backgro ariance in readin he socio-econor	onship betwee ound and read ng performance mic background	n students' ing performa explained of students)	nce
Use of standardised assessme	Percer in r afte nts	ntage of variati eading perform by school sys r taking into ac	on between co bance accounte stem features, scount GDP/ca	untries d for pita ¹	Correlation coefficient	Percentage of of relation back accou afte	variation betw ship between kground and re inted for by scl r taking into ac	veen countries i students' socio- ading performa hool system fea ccount GDP/caj	n the strength economic ance tures, pita ¹	Correlation coefficient
Existence of standards-based external examinations					0.32					-0.27
Percentage of students in schools that assess students with standardised tests					0.14					-0.23
Use of assessment or achievem	ent data for be	nchmarking an	d information p	urposes						
Provide comparative information to parents (relative to national/regional population)					0.15					-0.04
Have their progress tracked by administrative authorities					-0.12	1				-0.03
Compare the school with other schools	þ				0.06	1				-0.01
Monitor progress over time	1				0.04					-0.13
Post achievement data publicly	1				0.03					0.09
Use of assessment or achievem	ent data for de	cision making								
Allocate resources					-0.09					0.22
Monitor teacher practices	1				-0.05					-0.01
Make curricular decisions					0.04					-0.24
	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	40 %	0 1	0 2	20 3	0 4	10 %

Between-school variance

Luxambourg		1
cuxcinoourg		÷
Turkey		HC
Lithuania		
B		+
reru		L
Montenegro		Г
United States		
Office states		L .
Trinidad and Tobago		I
Czech Republic		
Caccel Republic		+
Macao-China		L
Hungary		Г
Greece		
Greece		+
Albania		
srae		Г
Singanore		t i
Singapore		L .
Hong Kong-China		
Brazil		
Chience Trinoi		-
Chinese taiper		L
Chile		
ltaly		t i
· · · · · ·		+
Croatia		L
United Kingdom		Г
Uning		t i
Unuguay		+
Jordan		
Germany		Г
Certifiany		+
Nyrgyzstan		L
OECD average		
Colombia		F
Colombia		L
Russian Federation		
Australia		
Eastin		+
Serbia		L
Tunisia		
Slovak Republic		
Natharlande		H
recuentations		L .
New Zealand		
Shanghai-China		t i
Shanghai-China		ŧ.
Shanghai-China Argentina		Ē
Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal		Ē
Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzedand		
Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Koma		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Fetoria		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Logard		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Irreland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Mexico Istonia Mexico Estonia Latvia Latvia Latvia Latvia Canada Sweden		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Irreland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Latvia Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Irreland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Mexico Estonia Carada Denmark Spain Latvia Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Irreland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama Japan		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Austria Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama Japan Belgium		
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Irreland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Latvia Iceland Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Norway Poland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama Japan Belgium	Image: set of the	
New Zearand Shanghai-China Argentina Portugal Switzerland Qatar Ireland Korea Slovenia Mexico Estonia Kazakhstan Denmark Spain Latvia Leavia Indonesia Romania Canada Sweden Finland Finland Azerbaijan Thailand Panama Japan Belgium Bulgaria		

■ Figure IV.2.7 ■	
ow schools' assessment and accountability policies are related to reading p	erformance
Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD co (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countrie	untries es)
Variance in reading performance:	
□ Solely accounted for by schools' assessment and accountability policies	
Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and by schools' assessment and accountability policies	
Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background	

Unaccounted for by any of the above factors

01 08 03 04 05 0

- The generally weak relationship between resources and performance observed in past research is also seen in PISA.
- At the level of the education system, accounting for the level of national income, the only type of resource that PISA shows to be correlated with student performance is the level of teachers' salaries relative to national income (Figure IV.2.8).
- As shown in Chapter 3, teachers' salaries are related to class size in that if spending levels are similar, school systems often make trade-offs between smaller classes and higher salaries for teachers.
- The findings from PISA suggest that teachers' salaries are correlated with overall performance, such that school systems that choose to invest in higher salaries for teachers show higher-than-average student performance.
- This is consistent with school-effects research that underscores the costeffectiveness of investing in teacher quality rather than in reducing class size (Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, 1996; Rivkin, Hanushek and Kain, 2005).



■ Figure IV.2.8 ■

How school systems' resources are related to educational outcomes

		Reading	g performance	e		Stree socio-ecor (V by t	ngth of relatio nomic backgro ariance in readir he socio-econon	nship betweet ound and read ng performance nic background	n students' ing performat explained of students)	nce
	Percer in <i>r</i> e afte	ntage of variatio eading perform by school sys r taking into ac	on between co nance accounte stem features, ccount GDP/ca	untries d for pita¹	Correlation coeffident	Percentage of of relation back account afte	variation betw ship between s kground and re unted for by sch r taking into ac	een countries i students' socio- ading performa nool system fea count GDP/cap	n the strength economic ance tures, pita ¹	Correlation coefficient
Teachers' salaries relative to GDP/capita					0.39					0.14
Average index of extra-curricular activities (higher values indicate more activities)					0.26					0.10
Cumulative expenditure by educational institutions per student aged 6 to 15					0.21					-0.10
Average class size for the language of instruction					-0.13]				0.07
Percentage of students who take after-school lessons for enrichment purposes					-0.12					-0.15
Average number of minutes per week spent in regular school lessons on the language of instruction					-0.02					-0.07
Percentage of students who take after-school lessons for remedial purposes					0.00					-0.14
	 0 1	0 2	20 3	 0 4	0%	0	 10 2	20 3	6 0 4	 40 %

n

Between-school variance

Turkey						
		_				
Argentina	l – E					
Luxembourg	t – E	_				
Peru	t – E					
Uruguay	t E					
Italy	H E					
Panama	H E			_		
Chile					F	
Netherlands	╞					
Relation	╞	_				
Dubai (UAD)	╞				L	
Dubai (UAE)	╞	===			5	
nungary	╞					
Qatai	╞					
Japan	╞				<u> </u>	
Germany						
Croatia						
Israel	- E					
Colombia	- E					
Montenegro	⊢ – E	-				
Bulgaria	⊢ E					
Singapore	⊢ E					
United States	⊢ E	-				
Greece	I E					
Czech Kepublic	↓ F					
Macao-China	I F					
Brazil	F	-				
Slovenia		_				
Kyrgyzstan		_				
Shanghai-China						
OECD average		-				
Austria		-			•	
Portugal		-				
Hong Kong-China		-				
United Kingdom		_				
Slovak Republic						
Mexico		_				
Jordan		_				
Tunisia						
Albania						
Australia						
Serbia				>		
Chinese Taipei						
Romania						
Korea						
Ireland						
New Zealand	<u>н</u>					
Switzerland	t E					
Kazakhstan	t E					
Poland						
Sweden	6)			
Latvia	1 6					
Lithuania)			
Estonia	1 6					
Indonesia						
Canada	t 6		1			
Russian Federation	1 6		5		1	
Denmark	 					
Snain						
Thailand					1	
Azerbaijan	<u> </u> – Ľ					
	+ E					
Norway						
Norway	<u> </u> E					

Figure IV.2.9

How school resources are related to reading performance

Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countries)

Variance in reading performance:

- □ Solely accounted for by resources invested in education
- Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and by resources invested in education

■ Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background

Unaccounted for by any of the above factors

How the learning environment is related to student performance

- How schools are organised and governed tends to influence learning in schools and classrooms indirectly. PISA has also looked at aspects of the learning environment that affect learning more directly.
- This analysis examines how teacher-student relations, disciplinary climate, student- and teacher-related factors affecting school climate, teachers' stimulation of students, school principals' leadership and their perceptions of parents' pressure to raise academic standards and achievement relate to student performance.
- Most of the measures of the learning environment are based on the perceptions and opinions of students and school principals.
- Since it is difficult to compare perceptions and options across countries this section examines relationships between these aspects and student performance within each country.

	Between-school variance
Irinidad and Tohago	
Linembourg	
Catenhoodig	
Germany	
Argentina	
Japan	
Turkey	
Croatia	
Ci Onem	
cruguay	
Singapore	
Italy	
Montenegro	
Czech Republic	
Macao-China	
Chile	
Australia	
Australia	
New Zealand	
United States	
United Kingdom	
Colombia	
Hong Kong Chies	
Hong Kong-China	
Ireland	
Shanghai-China	
Kyrgyzstan	
srael	
OFCD average	
Panama	
Cashia	
Serbia	
Netherlands	
Korea	
Hungary	
Peru	
Beigium	
Sweden	
Greece	
lordan	
Bondan	
Komania	
Brazil	
Austria	
Switzerland	
() Denmark	
Slovak Republic	
Oatar	
Slauncia	
adventa Dubai d'Utra	
Dubai (UAE)	
Albania	
Spain	
Kazakhstan	
Canada	
Chinese Tainai	
Bulancia	
Buigaria	
Russian Federation	
Tunisia	
Lithuania	
Estonia	
Iceland	
Poland	
- Charles	
Prove to see to	
Portugal	
Indonesia	
Portugal Indonesia Finland	
Finland Norway	
Finland Norway Latvia	
Portugal Indonesia Finland Norway Latvia Thailand	
Portugal Indonesia Finland Norway Latvia Thailand Azerbaijan	
Portugal Indonesia Finland Norway Latvia Thailand Azerbaijan Mexico	

Figure IV.2.11

How the learning environment at school is related to reading performance

Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countries)

Variance in reading performance:

- Solely accounted for by the learning environment
- Jointly accounted for by students' and schools socio-economic and demographic background and by the learning environment

Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background

Unaccounted for by any of the above factors

■ Figure IV.2.13 ■

How student and school characteristics are related to reading performance

Expressed as a percentage of the average variance in reading performance in OECD countries (100% is the average total variance in reading performance across OECD countries)

Variance in reading performance:

- Solely accounted for by students' reading engagement and approaches to learning, the learning environment, resources, policies and practices
- Jointly accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background and by students' reading engagement and approaches to learning, the learning environment, resources, policies and practices

Solely accounted for by students' and schools' socio-economic and demographic background

Unaccounted for by any of the above factors

Within-school variance

Between-school variance

Trinidad and Tohago										Trinidad and Tobaro
Amontina	ł						1	-		Amentina
Turkay	ł								╤───	Argenuna
Turkey	ł – – ;									Turkey
Feru	I							<u> </u>	+	Peru
Hungary	I		_					<u> </u>	4	Hungary
Germany									+	Germany
Bulgaria	L			-						Bulgaria
Uruguay										Uruguay
Italy						<u> </u>			<u> </u>	Italy
Chile					-					Chile
Belgium					-		<u> </u>			Belgium
Panama								-		Panama
Dubai (UAE)							_	÷	1	Dubai (UAE)
Qatar										Oatar
Czech Republic	1						<u></u>		1 1	Czech Republic
Istael	1 1								+	Israel
Netherlands	<u> </u>							— —	1	Netherlands
United States	├ ───┤								++	United States
lanan	+						<u> </u>	+	+	Janan
Austria	ł							<u> </u>	P	Austria
Creatia	I								+	Austria
Citodia	I							i		Croaua
Singapore							<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Singapore
Brazii							<u> </u>			Brazil
Colombia										Colombia
Greece				-			÷		T	Greece
OECD average							1			OECD average
Serbia							÷			Serbia
United Kingdom							1			United Kingdom
Slovenia							ė	i	i –	Slovenia
New Zealand							 	+	++	New Zealand
Shanghai-China							1			Shanghai-China
Hong Kong-China	1						1		+	Hong Kong-China
Kyrgyzstan	1 1								+	Kyrgyzstan
Slovak Republic	<u> </u>						.	i	i	Slovak Republic
Australia	╞╴╴╒┙						+	 	++	Australia
Albania		_			_		<u> </u>		÷	Albania
Koma	ł – – I									Koran
Korea							<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Ļ	Norea
Deserts	I		-							Ifeiand
Komahia	I		L						P	Komania
Portugal	L									Portugal
Switzerland								L		Switzerland
Jordan										Jordan
Mexico							1	-	1	Mexico
Chinese Taipei							T		T	Chinese Taipei
Tunisia							1			Tunisia
Sweden						1	i	1	i	Sweden
Poland							1	1	1	Poland
Kazakhstan							!	!	<u> </u>	Kazakhstan
Lithuania	1 1						1		+	Lithuania
Pussian Enderation	<u> </u>		-					<u> </u>	<u>+</u>	Dussian Enderation
Kussian Peueration	ł					f	+	+	+	Engine Contraction
- Spani	ł					<u> </u>	+	+		Span
Estonia				_		<u> </u>	+		+	Estonia
Canada	I					<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Canada
Latvia								Ļ		Latvia
Denmark								<u>i</u>	1	Denmark
Indonesia										Indonesia
Thailand							Ţ		Ţ	Thailand
lceland				_						loeland
										Azerbaijan
Azerbaijan										
Azerbaijan Finland							1	i		Finland
Azerbaijan Finland Norway										Finland Norway
Azerbaijan Finland Norway										Finland Norway

- These sections have described how organisational configurations of schools systems and the learning environment in individual schools interrelate with socio-economic factors to influence student performance. These relationships can also be examined in association with the findings discussed in Volume III, *Learning to Learn*, which focus on the association between students' reading habits, their approaches to learning and student performance.
- After considering the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of students, their reading habits and approaches to learning, the learning environment and school organisation, across OECD countries, almost 1/3 of the student-level variation and almost 9/10 of the between-school variation in performance can be explained by aspects measured by PISA.



Chapter 3 How schooling is Organised

This chapter provides detailed descriptions and in-depth analyses of selected organisational features of schools and systems that affect student performance. These include how students are sorted into grades, schools and programmes, school autonomy, school competition, how schools and school systems use student assessments, and resources devoted to education.

	1	Age of entry into primary school	Grade repetition	15-year-olds in different grades an	d education	levels
		Percentage of students who started at:		Percentage of students in:	Percer of stude	ntage ents in:
	Average age (years old)	Age 5 or below Age 6 Age 7 or above	Percentage of students who repeated one or more grades	Grade below the modal grade The modal grade Grade above the modal grade	Lower secondary education (%)	Upper secondary education (%)
Australia	5.2		8.4		81	19
Austria	6.2		12.6		7	93
Belgium	5.9		34.9		9	91
Canada	5.2		8.4		15	85
Chile	6.0		23.4		5	95
Czech Republic	6.4		4.0		54	46
Denmark	6.6		4.4		99	1
Estonia	6.9		5.6		98	2
Finland	6.7		2.8		100	0
France	5.9		36.9		37	63
Germany	6.3		21.4		97	3
Greece	6.3		5.7		7	93
Hungary	6.8		11.1		10	90
Iceland	5.8		0.9		98	2
Ireland	4.5		12.0		02	30
Israel	5.0		16.0		14	00
lanan	5.5		0.0		0	100
Korea	6.0		0.0		4	96
Luxembourg	6.2		36.5		62	38
Mexico	6.2		21.5		44	56
Netherlands	6.0		26.7		74	26
New Zealand	5.1		5.1		6	94
Norway	5.8		0.0		100	0
Poland	7.0		5.3		99	1
Portugal	6.0		35.0		44	56
Slovak Republic	6.3		3.8		39	61
Slovenia	6.7		1.5		3	97
Spain	5.9		35.3		100	0
Sweden	6.6		4.6		98	2
Switzerland	6.5		22.8		79	21
Turkey	6.9		13.0		4	96
United Kingdom	5.0		2.2		0	100
United States	5.9		14.2		11	89
OECD average	6.1		13.0		46	54
				2. Re	ekstur sl	kóla

A ment of the standards and an estimate and have the set



School admittance policies



2. Rekstur skóla



- Vertical differentiation
 - Age of entry into the school system
 - Grade repetition
- Horizontal differentiation at the system level
 - Programmes of study and age of selection
 - School admission policies
- Horizontal differentiation at the school level
 - Student transferring policies
 - Ability grouping within schools



How school systems select and group students for schools, grades and programmes

		Low vertical d	lifferentiation	High vertical (differentiation
		Students who repeated Students out of mod	one or more grades: 7% dal starting ages: 7%	Students who repeated of Students out of mod	one or more grades: 29% al starting ages: 11%
Country	profiles in	Low horizontal differentiation at the school level	<u>High</u> horizontal differentiation at the school level	Low horizontal differentiation at the school level	High horizontal differentiation at the school level
students	and grouping	Schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs: 15%	Schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs: 33%	Schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs: 15%	Schools that transfer students to other schools due to low achievement, behavioural problems or special learning needs: 33%
		Schools that group students by ability in all subjects: 8%	Schools that group students by ability in all subjects: 38%	Schools that group students by ability in all subjects: 8%	Schools that group students by ability in all subjects: 38%
Low horizontal differentiation at the system level	Number of school types or distinct educational programmes: 1.1 First age of selection: 15.8 Selective schools: 17%	Australia, ¹ Canada, ² Denmark, Estonia, ² Finland, ² Greece, Iceland,² New Zealand, ¹ Norway, ² Poland, ¹ Sweden, United States, United Kingdom, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Russian Federation	Jordan	Spain, Argentina, Brazil, Tunisia, Uruguay	Chile, Colombia, Peru
<u>Medium</u> horizontal differentiation at the system level	Number of school types or distinct educational programmes: 3.0 First age of selection: 14.5 Selective schools: 42%	Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, ² Korea, ² Slovenia, Albania, Azerbaijan, Dubai (UAE), Hong Kong-China, ² Montenegro, Shanghai-China, ¹ Thailand	Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, Romania, Chinese Taipei	Mexico, Portugal	Luxembourg, Macao-China, Panama
High horizontal differentiation at the system level	Number of school types or distinct educational programmes: 4.3 First age of selection: 11.2 Selective schools: 61%	Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovak Republic, Croatia, Liechtenstein, Singapore ¹	Turkey, Bulgaria, Serbia	Belgium, ¹ Germany, Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands, ¹ Switzerland ¹

Note: The estimates in the grey cells indicate the average values of the variables used in latent profile analysis in each group. See Annex A5 for technical details. 1. Perform higher than the OECD average in reading.

2. Perform higher than the OECD average in reading and where the relationship between students' socio-economic background and reading performance is weaker than the

School autonomy

PISA 2009 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, establishing teachers' starting salaries and salary raises, 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, determining which courses are offered and the content of those courses).

This information was combined to create two composite indices:

Index of school responsibility for resource allocation,

Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment, 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.



School autonomy

Figure IV.3.3a

How much autonomy individual schools have 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" have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks

- A Selecting teachers for hire
 B Dismissing teachers
 C Establishing teachers' starting salaries
- D Determining teachers' salaries increases
- E Formulating the school budget

- F Deciding on budget allocations within the school
- 1 Only "principals and/or teachers"
- 2 Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority"
- Only "regional and/or national education authority"



A Selecting teache B Dismissing teac C Establishing teac	ers for hir hers chers' sta	e rting	salar	D Determining teachers' salaries increases Formulating the school budget F Deciding on budget allocations within the school Average index																				
	A 1 2	3	1	B 2	3	1	C 2	3	1	D 2	3	1	E 2	3	1	F 2	3	Index of school res	ponsi	bility for	resource	e alloca	tion	Variability in the index (S.D.)
Australia	61 20	19	43	12	45	12	5	84	13	6	81	68	16	16	93	6	0				- 2			0.9
Austria	13 35	5 52	5	26	68	1	0	99	1	0	99	11	9	80	84	12	4							0.3
Belgium	75 13	3 12	63	21	17	0	1	99	0	1	99	56	18	26	63	19	17				8			0.3
Canada	54 39	9 7	17	35	48	3	5	92	4	6	91	25	30	45	76	19	5				1			0.5
Chile	69 (3 23	59	3	38	37	1	62	37	1	62	55	9	36	71	9	20			Ó				1.2
Czech Republic	100 (0 (99	1	0	77	15	8	65	25	11	55	36	9	75	24	1				+			1.2
Denmark	97 1	2 0	69	15	16	20	10	70	16	14	70	80	13	8	98	2	0			•	-			0.9
Estonia	98 2	2 0	95	5	0	7	20	73	12	33	55	37	54	9	85	15	1		n de			. J.		0.6
Finland	32 43	3 25	18	19	63	8	7	84	5	15	80	36	41	23	92	6	1				3			0.5
France	wv	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w							w
Germany	29 36	5 34	7	14	79	3	0	97	4	15	81	29	4	67	97	2	2	1						0.5
Greece	0 1	99	0	2	98	0	0	100	0	0	100	34	7	59	59	7	34	•						0.1
Hungary	99 1	0	97	2	1	49	7	44	56	7	37	73	15	12	92	5	2							1.2
Iceland	94 (5 0	93	7	0	7	13	80	4	16	80	57	30	13	77	22	0				1			0.5
Ireland	61 25	5 14	36	14	50	0	2	98	1	0	99	60	13	27	89	5	6	1			3			0.2
Israel	67 30) 3	49	38	13	9	4	87	13	6	80	15	26	59	66	24	11		•		1			0.8
Italy	9 10	82	9	6	84	3	0	97	3	0	96	7	7	86	69	11	21							0.5
Japan	25 2	2 73	22	1	77	13	0	87	16	3	80	28	4	69	89	3	8				-			1.0
Korea	32 (62	23	4	74	8	0	92	6	0	94	29	12	58	86	6	8							0.7
Luxembourg	21 41	38	19	36	45	6	0	94	6	0	94	31	57	12	78	14	8		•					0.8
Mexico	34 .	5 61	22	4	73	8	0	92	6	0	94	46	6	48	- 71	7	22							0.8
Netherlands	100) 0	99	1	0	72	8	20	55	12	33	99	1	0	100	0	0				•			1.0
New Zealand	100 0) 0	89	7	4	9	3	88	15	21	64	95	4	1	- 99	1	0				-			0.7
Norway	72 21	6	44	22	34	8	4	88	6	13	81	55	28	17	88	12	1		•					0.6
Poland	87 12	2 1	90	10	0	9	20	71	4	20	77	7	42	51	26	43	31							0.4
Portugal	13 57	7 30	14	0	86	5	0	94	5	0	94	63	10	27	89	3	8							0.7
Slovak Republic	98 2	2 0	98	2	0	39	27	34	32	33	35	45	40	15	70	27	3			•				1.1
Slovenia	96 4	+ 1	88	10	1	7	11	82	13	31	56	26	49	26	78	21	1		m o i i					0.6
Spain	31 3	66	32	1	67	3	2	95	3	2	95	63	4	33	93	4	3							0.6
Sweden	96 4	1 0	63	17	20	57	16	27	69	22	9	64	20	16	93	5	2							1.1
Switzerland	82 19	5 3	60	26	15	8	8	84	8	13	79	35	30	35	83	13	4							0.7
Turkey	1 1	99	2	2	96	1	0	99	1	0	99	34	19	47	56	16	28	•						0.2
United Kingdom	90 9) 0	70	22	8	52	23	25	67	17	15	57	29	14	95	5	1							1.1
United States	88 12	2 0	75	19	6	17	5	78	18	6	75	54	29	16	83	13	4							0.9
OECD average	61 14	4 25	51	13	37	17	7	77	17	10	73	46	22	32	81	12	8		, d					0.7
η																					2.	Rek	stur	skóla

School autonomy

■ Figure IV.3.3b ■

How much autonomy individual schools have 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" have a considerable responsibility for the following tasks

Establishing student assessment policies

- B Choosing which textbooks are used
- C Determining course content

D Deciding which courses are offered

Only "principals and/or teachers"

- 2 Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority"
- 3 Only "regional and/or national education authority"

A Establishing st B Choosing white C Determining c D Deciding white	uden ch te cours ch co	it ass xtbo e coi ourse	essm oks a ntent s are	are us t offe	oolic sed red	ies							 Range between top and bottom quarter Average index 	
	1	A 2	3	1	B 2	3	1	C 2	3	1	D 2	3	Index of school responsibility for curriculum and assessment	Variability in the index (S.D.)
Australia	65	33	2	92	8	0	46	40	14	75	24	1		0.9
Austria	57	27	15	94	5	1	37	40	23	32	40	29		0.8
Belgium	78	19	4	94	4	1	32	42	26	40	46	13		0.8
Canada	28	62	10	40	49	11	12	51	38	44	54	3		0.6
Chile	72	21	6	73	20	7	43	22	35	64	20	16		1.0
Czech Republic	95	5	0	89	11	1	83	16	1	88	11	1		0.8
Denmark	61	28	11	100	0	0	56	32	12	47	39	14		0.9
Estonia	63	33	3	66	32	2	66	30	4	79	20	2		0.9
Finland	50	43	7	98	2	0	32	52	16	55	39	6		0.8
France	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w		w
Germany	71	21	9	84	13	3	21	47	32	80	18	2		0.7
Greece	20	12	68	7	8	85	1	3	96	6	5	88		0.3
Hungary	94	6	0	98	2	0	49	36	15	43	28	29		0.9
Iceland	92	8	1	93	4	3	61	26	13	48	42	10		0.9
Ireland	87	13	0	97	3	0	29	37	34	78	21	1		0.7
Israe	80	20	0	- 53	43	4	52	44	- 5	44	50	6		1.0
Italy	91	8	1	99	1	0	59	27	14	49	25	27		0.9
Japan	98	2	0	89	8	3	93	6	1	94	5	2		0.7
Korea	92	6	2	96	4	0	89	8	2	79	17	- 4		0.8
Luxembourg	9	33	58	13	80	7	9	72	20	18	61	21		0.6
Mexico	56	15	29	63	11	26	14	7	79	5	5	91		0.5
Netherlands	99	1	0	100	0	0	87	12	1	89	10	1		0.6
New Zealand	81	17	2	- 99	1	0	79	20	1	92	8	0		0.8
Norway	38	36	27	97	2	1	30	40	30	23	33	44		0.7
Poland	92	8	0	92	8	0	93	7	0	40	31	29		0.8
Portugal	35	37	28	- 98	2	0	5	3	92	10	5	86		0.4
Slovak Republic	76	21	3	56	39	5	48	47	5	52	48	1		1.0
Slovenia	46	48	5	72	27	1	34	59	6	28	52	20		0.8
Spain	44	34	23	95	5	0	32	31	37	30	31	39		0.8
Sweden	66	30	3	99	1	0	66	26	8	53	25	22		1.0
Switzerland	57	27	16	40	40	20	21	41	38	24	50	27		0.7
Turkey	42	29	30	14	18	68	9	15	76	14	21	65		0.4
United Kingdom	88	12	0	- 98	2	0	77	20	2	86	14	0		0.8
United States	46	40	13	62	28	10	36	46	18	58	37	4		0.9
OECD average	66	23	11	78	15	8	45	31	24	50	28	21		0.8

How school systems are governed

Figure IV.3.5

How school systems are governed

		Less school competition	More school competition
		Schools that complete with other schools for students in the same area: 73%	Schools that complete with other schools for students in the same area: 89%
		Private schools: 8%	Private schools: 52%
<u>Less</u> school autonomy for curriculum and assessment	Establish student assessment policies: 61% Choose which textbooks are used: 55% Determine course content: 14% Decide which courses are offered: 18%	Greece, Mexico, Portugal, Turkey, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kazakhstan, Jordan, Montenegro, Qatar, Serbia, Tunisia, Uruguay,	_
<u>More</u> school autonomy for curriculum and assessment	Establish student assessment policies: 92% Choose which textbooks are used: 97% Determine course content: 85% Decide which courses are offered: 87%	Austria, Canada, ² Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, ² Finland, ² Germany, Hungary, Iceland, ² Israel, Italy, Japan, ² Luxembourg, New Zealand, ¹ Norway, ² Poland, ¹ Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, ¹ United Kingdom, United States, Panama, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Shanghai-China, ¹ Singapore, ¹ Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago	Australia, ¹ Belgium, ¹ Chile, Ireland, Korea, ² Netherlands, ¹ Dubai (UAE), Hong Kong-China, ² Indonesia, Macao-China, Chinese Taipei

Note: The estimates in the grey cells indicate the average values of the variables used in latent profile analysis in each group. See Annex A5 for technical details.

1. Perform higher than the OECD average in reading.

2. Perform higher than the OECD average in reading and where the relationship between students' socio-economic background and reading performance is weaker than the OECD average.

Assessment and accountability policies

- Assessment practices and purposes
 - An average of 76% of students in OECD countries are enrolled in schools whose principals reported that they use standardised tests for 15-year-old students.
 - Some 59% of students across OECD countries are in schools whose principals reported that they use achievement data to compare their students' achievement levels either with those in other schools or to national or regional performance measures.
 - It is more common for schools to use achievement information to monitor school progress from year to year; on average some 77% of students in OECD countries attend schools that do so.



Country profiles in assessment and accountability policies

Figure IV.3.6

How school systems use student assessments

		Infrequent use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes	<u>Frequent</u> use of assessment or achievement data for benchmarking and information purposes
		Provide comparative information to parents: 32%	Provide comparative information to parents: 64%
		Compare the school with other schools: 38%	Compare the school with other schools: 73%
		Monitor progress over time: 57%	Monitor progress over time: 89%
		Post achievement data publicly: 20%	Post achievement data publicly: 47%
_		Have their progress tracked by administrative authorities: 46%	Have their progress tracked by administrative authorities: 79%
<u>Infrequent</u> use of assessment or achievement data for decision making	Make curricular decisions: 60% Allocate resources: 21% Monitor teacher practices: 50%	Austria, Belgium, ¹ Finland, ² Germany, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, ¹ Switzerland, ¹ Liechtenstein	Hungary, Norway,² Turkey, Montenegro, Tunisia, Slovenia
<u>Frequent</u> use of assessment or achievement data for decision making	Making curricular decisions: 88% Allocating resources: 40% Monitor teacher practices: 65%	Denmark, Italy, Japan,² Spain, Argentina, Macao-China, Chinese Taipei, Uruguay	Australia, ¹ Canada, ² Chile, Czech Republic, Estonia, ² Iceland, ² Israel, Korea, ² Mexico, New Zealand, ¹ Poland, ¹ Portugal, Slovak Republic, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Albania, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Dubai (UAE), Hong Kong-China, ² Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Shanghai-China, ¹ Singapore, ¹ Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Serbia

3. Námsmat og ábyrgð

Resources invested in education

• Learning time

 On average across OECD countries, students reported spending approximately 3 hours and 40 minutes per week in classes on the language of instruction.

• Extra-curricular activities

 Extra-curricular activities take many forms, including sports activities, academic activities, and courses in the arts and culture, and they can also improve students' non-cognitive skills.



Student learning time

The data on students' learning time used in this report are based on 15year-old students' self-reports on their "typical" use of time per week at the time of the PISA data collection.

The time students spend learning each subject might vary according to the week. The number of instruction weeks per year may also vary across education systems, depending on the length of the school year and vacation time.

System-level data on the number of weeks of instruction time, as part of the teachers' working time (OECD, 2009c), is used as a proxy for the number of instruction weeks per year in each education system. This is then multiplied by the number of school lessons per week, taken from the students' reports.

A linear relationship between the two indicators confirms that the number of hours per week spent in regular school lessons is a good proxy for the number of hours per year spent in regular school lessons.

Móðurmálstímar á unglingastigi

Figures IV.3.a

Relationship between learning hours per week and learning hours per year in the language of instruction



1

Regular lessons at school in language of instruction



Extra-curricular activities

- In PISA 2009, school principals were asked to report whether the following extra-curricular activities are offered by the school:
 - a band, an orchestra or choir;
 - school plays or school musicals;
 - a school yearbook,
 - a newspaper or magazine;
 - volunteering or service activities;
 - a book club;
 - a debating club or debating activities;
 - a school club or competition for foreign language, math or science;
 - an academic club;
 - an art club or art activities;
 - a sport team or sports activities;
 - lectures and/or seminars;
 - collaboration with local libraries; and
 - collaboration with local newspapers.



Index of schools' extra-curricular activities



Chapter 4 **The Learning Environment**

Students perform better in orderly classrooms and with the support of engaged teachers and parents. Using reports from students, school principals and, for some countries, parents, this chapter describes and analyses six key aspects of the learning environment: teacher and student behaviours that affect learning, the disciplinary climate, teacher-student relations, how teachers stimulate students' engagement in reading, parents' involvement in and expectation of schooling, and school principals' leadership.

Teacher-student relations

Figure IV.4.1

Students' views of teacher-student relations

Index of teacher-student relations based on students' reports

- I get along well with most of my teachers.
- B Most of my teachers are interested in my well-being.
- Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say.
- D If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers.
- E Most of my teachers treat me fairly.

	Per	rcentage or str ith the fo	of stude ongly ago ollowing	nts agree reeing statemen	ing ts	R	ange betwee werage index	n top and botton	n quarter	Variability in the index	School variability in the distribution of the index (Proportion of the index variance between
	Α	В	С	D	E		0	38		(S.D.)	schools)
<u>Australia</u>	85	78	71	84	85		-	•	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	1.0	0.04
Austria	87	59	61	67	77	B				1.1	0.07
Belgium	83	63	67	84	86				S	0.9	0.04
Canada	89	80	74	89	88		-	•		1.0	0.07
Chile	85	74	72	77	71			•		1.0	0.06
Czech Republic	80	67	57	78	72		•			0.9	0.06
Denmark	89	79	71	79	85			•		1.0	0.06
Estonia	86	76	60	85	75					0.8	0.04
Finland	87	49	63	84	80		•			0.9	0.03
France	78	53	62	80	88		•			0.9	0.05
Germany	85	58	69	71	77					1.1	0.05
Greece	87	66	62	63	65		•			1.0	0.06
Hungary	86	68	79	77	74					0.9	0.05
Iceland	88	73	74	82	80			•	-	1.1	0.09
Ireland	82	76	63	77	81					1.0	0.03
Israel	83	61	68	70	80			•	-	1.1	0.10
Italy	82	72	62	77	79					1.0	0.08
Japan	73	28	63	64	74		•			1.0	0.05
Korea	79	60	57	83	75		+			0.8	0.06
Luxembourg	82	59	63	72	78	-				1.1	0.04
Mexico	86	77	77	78	75			•		1.0	0.05
Netherlands	87	61	66	85	85					0.8	0.02
New Zealand	88	77	73	87	86			•		1.0	0.04
<u>Norway</u>	84	57	55	74	74	-	•			1.0	0.06
Poland	81	35	60	73	71		•			0.9	0.04
Portugal	94	89	82	90	82			•	-	0.9	0.03
Slovak Republic	85	71	66	79	75		•			0.8	0.08
Slovenia	80	30	56	74	74		•			0.9	0.08
Spain	82	70	67	68	79					1.0	0.09
Sweden	89	75	71	82	82			•		1.0	0.07
Switzerland	85	69	70	82	83			•	-	1.1	0.07
Turkey	86	88	78	87	69			•		1.2	0.04
United Kingdom	86	78	69	88	83			•		0.9	0.04
United States	90	81	74	88	89			•		1.1	0.08
OECD average	85	66	67	79	79			•		1.0	0.06

Disciplinary climate

Figure IV.4.2

Students' views of how conducive classrooms are to learning

Index of disciplinary climate based on students' reports

- A Students don't listen to what the teacher says.
- B There is noise and disorder.
- C The teacher has to wait a long time for the students to quieten down.
- D Students cannot work well.
- E Students don't start working for a long time after the lesson begins.

	Perce the "never o	ntage of following r hardly	students g phenor ever" or	reportin mena hap "in some	g that pen lessons″	 Range between top and bottom quarter Average index 	Variability in the index	variability in the distribution of the index (Proportion of the index variance between schoole)
 Accester line 	A	64	C 74	02	76		(5.D.)	SCHOOIS)
Australia	58	74	71	82	70		1.0	0.12
Q Rolaium	73	/4	/1 60	// 0E	70		1.2	0.17
Canada	72	61	72	0.0	72		1.0	0.10
Chile	74	62	65	92	70		0.9	0.13
Crach Pepublic	62	66	60	75	70		0.5	0.13
Denmark	72	65	78	88	82		0.8	0.22
Estonia	70	60	73	80	78		1.0	0.76
Finland	60	52	63	80	68		0.9	0.14
France	64	56	64	76	63		1.1	0.15
Germany	85	84	78	82	81		1.0	0.13
Greece	55	58	62	56	65		0.9	0.15
Hungary	71	71	69	80	78		1.0	0.16
Iceland	74	67	73	84	81		0.9	0.12
Ireland	64	65	70	81	75		1.1	0.10
Israel	78	75	73	77	74		1.0	0.19
Italy	66	68	70	81	74		1.1	0.23
lapan	92	90	93	87	91		0.9	0.27
Korea	90	77	88	90	87		0.8	0.08
Luxembourg	60	65	64	71	64		1.2	0.05
Mexico	79	73	79	83	77		0.9	0.12
Netherlands	68	59	63	81	55		0.9	0.08
New Zealand	68	61	68	82	74		1.0	0.09
Norway	67	61	66	77	67		0.9	0.17
Poland	67	74	74	79	80		1.0	0.17
Portugal	78	76	80	86	79		1.0	0.10
Slovak Republic	67	74	73	81	75		0.9	0.16
Slovenia	59	66	68	78	70		1.1	0.23
Spain	73	74	73	83	73		1.0	0.14
Sweden	75	67	71	83	76		0.9	0.18
Switzerland	72	74	74	81	76	◆ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.0	0.10
Turkey	86	77	74	77	78		0.9	0.08
United Kingdom	73	68	74	86	81	◆ → → →	1.0	0.14
United States	76	72	79	87	82	◆ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.0	0.14
OECD average	71	68	72	81	75		1.0	0.15

How teachers stimulate students' engagement with reading

■ Figure IV.4.3 ■

Students' views of how well teachers motivate them to read

Index of teachers' stimulation of students' reading engagement based on students' reports

- The teacher asks students to explain the meaning of a text.
- B The teacher asks questions that challenge students to get a better understanding of a text.
- C The teacher gives students enough time to think about their answers.
- D The teacher recommends a book or author to read.
- The teacher encourages students to express their opinion about a text.
- The teacher helps students relate the stories they read to their lives.
- The teacher shows students how the information in texts builds on what they already know.

	_	Perce the "never o	entage of e followir or hardly	students ng pheno ever″ or '	reportin mena oc "in some	g that cur lessons″	c.		Range be	etween top and	bottom quarter	Variability in the index	variability in the distribution of the index (Proportion of the index variance between
	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	•	Arenage	macx		(S.D.)	schools)
Australia	63	67	68	30	63	32	50			+		1.0	0.07
Austria	39	42	55	30	54	26	38			•		1.0	0.07
 Belgium 	43	56	65	24	51	27	34		_	•		0.9	0.05
Canada	61	65	68	37	65	44	53			•		1.0	0.10
Chile	48	59	59	49	57	43	57			•		1.0	0.09
Czech Republic	46	54	58	43	49	23	33		_	•		0.9	0.07
Denmark	76	80	60	30	58	45	50			•		0.9	0.07
Estonia	49	67	63	45	59	29	40			•		0.8	0.08
Finland	35	35	63	38	47	17	24			•		0.8	0.07
France	62	60	69	43	58	27	47			•		0.9	0.06
Germany	50	53	61	19	58	26	44			•		0.9	0.04
Greece	65	75	45	26	60	33	40					0.9	0.07
Hungary	56	64	71	38	63	45	52			•		0.9	0.10
lceland	30	44	53	25	38	32	36			•		1.0	0.09
Ireland	59	67	63	30	63	29	46			•		1.0	0.04
Israel	41	46	55	26	45	31	36			•		1.2	0.15
Italy	48	61	63	47	60	32	35			•		0.9	0.10
Japan	55	66	61	25	42	30	29			•		1.1	0.08
Korea	38	45	46	19	26	32	33					1.0	0.05
Luxembourg	58	60	56	36	55	28	42					1.0	0.01
Mexico	42	60	44	54	58	37	45			•		1.0	0.07
Netherlands	35	49	61	29	36	18	35			•		0.9	0.05
New Zealand	62	65	65	34	61	33	50			•		1.0	0.04
Norway	45	53	47	28	41	20	28			•		0.9	0.08
Poland	66	73	60	48	67	45	55			•		1.0	0.06
Portugal	64	49	68	46	63	37	51			•		0.9	0.03
Slovak Republic	44	60	57	35	52	38	39					0.9	0.09
Slovenia	63	68	62	41	65	46	48			•		1.0	0.07
Spain	41	49	53	48	53	27	40			•		1.0	0.09
Sweden	34	41	58	44	56	30	35			•		0.9	0.07
Switzerland	45	45	61	27	56	32	41			•		0.9	0.05
Turkey	71	75	70	59	67	51	53			•		1.1	0.06
United Kingdom	67	63	68	26	65	30	55			•		1.0	0.07
United States	69	73	70	43	66	51	59			•		1.2	0.07
OECD average	52	59	60	36	55	33	43					1.0	0.07

School

Student-related factors affecting school climate, according to school principals

■ Figure IV.4.4 ■

School principals' views of how student behaviour affects students' learning

Index of student-related factors affecting school climate based on school principals' reports

Student absenteeism



Disruption of classes by students Students skipping classes



- Students lacking respect for teachers
- Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs
- Students intimidating or bullying other students

	Percent reporte the lea	tage of st ed that th rning of s	udents in ne followi students	schools ing phen "not at al	whose pr omena hi l″ or "ver	rincipals ndered y little″		Variability in the index	
	A	B	С	D	E	F		▼ /werage macx	(S.D.)
Australia	52	69	77	77	96	81			1.0
Austria	44	55	60	70	97	71		• • • •	0.9
Belgium	69	72	79	83	95	89		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1.0
Canada	31	71	42	82	70	85			0.8
Chile	43	68	53	87	86	86			1.1
Czech Republic	37	43	75	62	95	93			0.8
Denmark	62	58	83	86	100	93		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.8
Estonia	50	62	37	77	96	89	S		0.8
Finland	27	38	57	67	96	71			0.7
France	w	w	W	W	w	w	1		W
Germany	77	55	84	82	93	82		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.9
Greece	61	54	72	74	92	87			1.0
Hungary	48	63	73	82	96	91	\square	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1.0
Iceland	74	53	80	77	90	92		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.8
Ireland	39	56	79	71	89	80	\square	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.8
Israel	46	57	58	81	97	93			0.9
Italy	51	56	51	81	95	92			0.9
Japan	67	91	89	76	98	93			0.9
Korea	79	76	93	71	92	87			0.9
Luxembourg	60	52	84	77	95	93	\square		0.8
Mexico	60	74	74	90	90	88		••••••	0.9
Netherlands	66	64	77	78	87	75			0.7
New Zealand	46	68	67	80	90	90			0.9
Norway	63	41	78	65	98	88			0.7
Poland	39	69	62	83	97	91			0.8
Portugal	56	54	59	76	97	93	\square		1.0
Slovak Republic	32	46	25	79	97	95		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.7
Slovenia	29	50	36	74	88	91			1.0
Spain	67	57	73	72	95	92		◆ → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → →	1.0
Sweden	49	58	61	78	99	82			0.7
Switzerland	73	63	82	83	91	89		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	0.8
Turkey	14	23	22	29	31	35		•	1.4
United Kingdom	62	85	89	88	97	97		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.7
United States	44	84	70	79	79	91			0.8
OECD average	52	60	67	76	91	86	\square		0.9

Teacher-related factors affecting school climate, according to school principals

■ Figure IV.4.5 ■

School principals' views of how teacher behaviour affects students' learning

Index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate based on school principals' reports

- A T
 - Teachers' low expectations of students
 - B Poor student-teacher relations
 - Teachers not meeting individual students' needs
 - D Teacher absenteeism
 - Staff resisting change
 - Teachers being too strict with students
 - Students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential

	Percenta tha	age of stu at the fol	idents in lowing p "not at a	schools v henomer all″ or "ve	whose pr na hinder ry little″	incipals r ed learni	reported ing	Range be	Variability in the index	
	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	✓ ///clage /	index	(S.D.)
Australia	68	85	58	86	61	96	78		• • •	0.91
Austria	86	94	78	78	76	97	87			0.84
Belgium	87	96	76	75	71	96	84		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.86
Canada	86	89	75	88	62	94	86			0.82
Chile	51	92	62	69	60	86	57		•	1.00
Czech Republic	83	83	94	96	86	90	75			0.72
Denmark 🔵	95	97	88	89	91	98	93			0.82
Estonia	82	87	68	89	87	82	77		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.83
Finland 🔵	94	88	67	80	84	97	86			0.69
France	w	w	w	w	w	w	w			w
Germany	82	93	77	78	70	96	89			0.75
Greece	64	82	70	86	76	89	76			1.05
Hungary	94	96	94	94	90	89	69			0.86
Iceland	90	88	71	83	84	97	92		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.85
Ireland	78	92	76	88	82	89	84			0.87
Israel	73	86	67	71	80	90	80		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.86
Italy	74	73	73	91	48	85	67		• • •	0.84
Japan	76	85	71	97	63	81	61		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.87
Korea	66	90	67	99	66	84	83		••••	0.79
Luxembourg	95	88	64	82	84	89	71		—	0.71
Mexico	65	81	69	78	59	80	60		•	1.01
Netherlands	66	90	44	62	61	86	45			0.67
New Zealand	63	83	57	95	73	95	82			0.79
Norway 🔘	80	90	52	75	79	98	77		• • • • •	0.71
Poland	90	98	89	77	85	98	91			0.86
Portugal	74	96	77	98	67	100	79			0.90
Slovak Republic	87	94	88	80	79	75	78			0.79
Slovenia	83	90	78	85	68	87	81			0.84
Spain	75	91	85	91	67	92	74		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.92
Sweden 🔘	77	93	64	87	67	99	75			0.83
Switzerland	94	91	81	96	74	97	89		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.73
Turkey	28	25	39	30	25	32	27	•		1.29
United Kingdom	79	97	77	87	83	98	92			0.80
United States	77	90	72	91	68	96	84			0.79
OECD average	78	88	72	83	72	90	77			0.84

Principal leadership

■ Figure IV.4.6 ■

School principals' views of their involvement in school matters

Index of school principal's leadership based on school principals' reports

- A I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school.
 B I ensure that teachers work according to the school's educational goals.
 C I observe instruction in classrooms.
 D I use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals.
 E I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.
 F I monitor students' work.
 G When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, I take the initiative to discuss matters.
 H I inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.
 I check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with our educational goals.
 J take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development.
 K I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for co-ordinating the curriculum.
 L When a teacher brings up a classroom problem, we solve the problem together.
 M I pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms.
 - I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent.

		Percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the following activities and behaviours occurred "quite often" or "very often" during the last school year														Range between top and bottom quarter	Variability
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	1	J	K	L	М	N	Average index In the (S.I	(S.D.)
	Australia	98	99	64	93	76	58	89	95	81	81	97	93	94	32	1.	.0
	Austria	89	92	41	60	67	86	84	79	67	22	75	92	87	53		.8
	Belgium	95	97	43	42	68	33	89	90	82	46	74	98	96	4	0.	.8
	Canada	98	98	77	91	86	60	95	95	86	63	87	99	98	19	— — — — 1 .	.0
	Chile	97	98	55	93	95	73	90	96	82	84	94	97	97	62		.1
	Czech Republic	95	98	57	81	79	93	86	98	83	59	93	96	75	23	• • • • • 0.	.8
	Denmark	86	89	25	44	53	39	94	91	76	25	76	99	95	29	0.	.6
	Estonia	92	94	59	84	58	75	72	93	57	62	87	83	79	24	0.	.9
	Finland	64	75	9	46	40	61	77	95	59	13	77	98	94	39	— — — 0.	.7
	France	W	W	w	w	w	w	W	w	w	W	w	w	w	w	W	V
	Germany	82	94	40	57	53	82	80	85	57	33	73	95	84	42	0.	.7
	Greece	40	78	12	61	53	46	97	96	67	34	69	98	96	63	1.	.0
	Hungary	93	99	54	84	62	84	89	91	65	73	86	94	91	41		8
	Iceland	88	89	39	78	77	69	87	96	54	58	87	100	75	26	0.	.7
	Ireland	88	88	14	64	41	50	88	92	62	78	88	97	97	39	● 0.	9
	Israel	94	99	46	87	85	81	94	89	86	90	94	97	98	26	0.	9
	Italy	97	99	39	86	- 75	87	96	98	88	77	92	98	98	18	0.	9
	Japan	43	51	37	30	38	40	29	50	31	37	29	61	60	17	0.	.9
	Korea	80	85	42	64	68	-56	75	69	60	46	63	79	68	7	1.	2
	Luxembourg	87	98	32	65	52	64	96	67	74	32	47	98	98	23	1.	.0
0	Mexico	95	97	68	94	89	90	95	91	92	62	90	97	96	43	1.	0
	Netherlands	95	97	52	66	73	50	76	82	79	75	80	86	71	16	0.	.7
	New Zealand	99	98	68	- 98	73	42	78	84	74	87	97	83	94	12	● 1.	0
	Norway	81	88	24	70	49	55	90	91	48	47	81	98	95	28	0.	.6
	Poland	94	97	93	95	89	96	91	99	92	71	80	97	93	37	0.	8
	Portugal	93	97	9	94	65	49	91	89	48	82	97	99	97	7	0.	.7
	Slovak Republic	97	99	86	87	86	90	86	98	91	76	96	91	91	15	0.	7
	Slovenia	99	100	77	78	85	90	90	95	85	65	93	98	94	23	0.	.8
	Spain	86	97	28	85	55	45	86	86	66	71	92	99	99	63	0.	9
	Sweden	90	96	38	83	63	29	89	90	52	68	93	98	87	13	0.	8
	Switzerland	72	82	64	34	60	61	85	80	59	17	54	92	83	31	0.	8
	Turkey	85	95	70	93	85	90	75	90	87	78	93	97	99	36	0.	9
	United Kingdom	100	100	93	100	92	88	90	96	95	97	99	96	97	29	0.	9
	United States	98	98	95	96	94	72	95	97	94	88	90	97	96	16		.1
	OECD average	88	93	50	75	69	66	86	89	72	61	82	94	90	29	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	9